

De Controversiis On the Roman Pontiff

Vol. II: Books 3-5



St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J.
Translated from the Latin
by Ryan Grant

CONTENTS

ON THE ROMAN PONTIFF

CONTENT INFORMATION

BOOK III: A DISPUTATION ON ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER I: A DISPUTATION IS PROPOSED ON
ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER II: ANTICHRIST IS GOING TO BE A CERTAIN,
SPECIFIC MAN

CHAPTER III: IT IS SHOWN THAT ANTICHRIST HAS
NOT YET COME.

CHAPTER IV: THE FIRST PROOF: THE RULE OF
ANTICHRIST HAS NOT YET BEGUN.

CHAPTER V: THE SECOND PROOF: DESOLATION OF THE
ROMAN EMPIRE

CHAPTER VI: A THIRD PROOF: ENOCH AND ELIJAH

CHAPTER VII: THE FOURTH PROOF: THE PERSECUTION
OF ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER VIII: THE FIFTH PROOF: THE DURATION OF
ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER IX: THE SIXTH PROOF: THE END OF THE
WORLD

CHAPTER X: ON THE NAME OF ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XI: ON THE MARK OF ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XII: ON THE BEGETTING OF ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XIII: ON THE SEAT OF ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER XIV: ON THE DOCTRINE OF ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER XV: ON THE MIRACLES OF ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XVI: ON THE KINGDOM AND BATTLES OF
ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XVII: ON GOG AND MAGOG.

CHAPTER XVIII: THE ABSURDITIES OF THE HERETICS
ARE REFUTED, IN WHICH THEY NOT ONLY TRY TO
SHOW, BUT IMPUDENTLY DECLARE THAT THE ROMAN
PONTIFF IS ANTICHRIST.

CHAPTER XIX: THE TRIFLES OF THE SMALCHALDICH
COUNCIL OF THE LUTHERANS ARE REFUTED.

CHAPTER XX: THE LIES OF CALVIN ARE REFUTED.

CHAPTER XXI: THE LIES OF ILLYRICUS ARE REFUTED.

*CHAPTER XXII: THE INEPTITUDE OF TILMAN IS
REFUTED.*

*CHAPTER XXIII: THE LIES OF CHYTRAEUS ARE
REFUTED.*

*CHAPTER XXIV: THE ARGUMENTS OF CALVIN AND
ILLYRICUS ARE REFUTED, WHERE THE FORMER TRIES TO
SHOW THE POPE IS NO LONGER A BISHOP, AND THE LATTER
ON THE FABLE OF “POPE JOAN”.*

BOOK IV: ON THE SUPREME SPIRITUAL POWER OF THE
POPE

CHAPTER I: WHETHER THE POPE IS THE SUPREME
JUDGE IN CONTROVERSIES OF FAITH AND MORALS.

CHAPTER II: A QUESTION IS PROPOSED: WHETHER A
JUDGMENT OF THE POPE IS CERTAIN?

CHAPTER III: THE FIRST PROPOSITION IS ESTABLISHED,
ON THE INFALLIBLE JUDGMENT OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF.

CHAPTER IV: ON THE ROMAN CHURCH IN
PARTICULAR.

CHAPTER V: ON DECREES OF MORALS.

CHAPTER VI: ON THE POPE AS A PARTICULAR PERSON.

CHAPTER VII: THE OBJECTIONS ARE ANSWERED BY
AN APPEAL TO REASON.

CHAPTER VIII: ON THE ERRORS WHICH ARE FALSELY
ASCRIBED TO THE ROMAN PONTIFFS PETER, LINUS,
ANACLETUS, THELESPHORUS, VICTOR, ZEPHYRINUS,

URBAN, PONTIAN, CORNELIUS AND MARCELINUS, WHO
WERE NOT ONLY POPES, BUT ALSO MARTYRS.

CHAPTER IX: ON LIBERIUS AND FELIX II.

CHAPTER X: ON SIRICIUS, INNOCENT AND SEVEN
OTHER POPES

CHAPTER XI: ON HONORIUS I.

CHAPTER XII: ON SEVEN OTHER POPES.

CHAPTER XIII: ON GREGORY VII.

CHAPTER XIV: ON THE REMAINING POPES TO WHOM
ERROR IN FAITH IS FALSELY ATTRIBUTED.

CHAPTER XV: A QUESTION IS PROPOSED: WHETHER
THE SUPREME PONTIFF HAS JURISDICTION THAT IS TRULY
COERCIVE, SO THAT HE CAN MAKE LAWS WHICH OBLIGE
IN CONSCIENCE AS WELL AS JUDGE AND PUNISH
TRANSGRESSORS?

CHAPTER XVI: THAT POPES CAN MAKE TRUE LAWS IS
PROVEN FROM THE TESTIMONY OF THE WORD OF GOD.

CHAPTER XVII: THE ARGUMENTS ADVANCED BY OUR
ADVERSARIES FROM THE TESTIMONY OF SCRIPTURE ARE
ANSWERED.

CHAPTER XVIII: THE ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED BY A
COMPARISON OF LAWS.

CHAPTER XIX: THE ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM
EXAMPLES IS ANSWERED.

CHAPTER XX: TWO ARGUMENTS OF CALVIN FROM THE
NOTION OF CONSCIENCE ARE ANSWERED.

CHAPTER XXI: AN ARGUMENT FROM THE FATHERS IS
ANSWERED.

CHAPTER XXII: THE LAST QUESTION IS PROPOSED:
WHETHER CHRIST CONFERRED ECCLESIASTICAL
JURISDICTION IMMEDIATELY TO THE SUPREME PONTIFF,
AND TO HIM ALONE?

CHAPTER XXIII: THE APOSTLES RECEIVED ALL
JURISDICTION FROM CHRIST.

CHAPTER XXIV: ALL BISHOPS RECEIVE JURISDICTION
FROM THE POPE.

CHAPTER XXV: THE ARGUMENTS OF OUR
ADVERSARIES ARE ANSWERED.

BOOK V: ON THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE

CHAPTER I: A QUESTION IS PROPOSED ON TEMPORAL
POWER.

CHAPTER II: THE POPE IS NOT THE LORD OF THE
WHOLE WORLD.

CHAPTER III: THE POPE IS NOT THE LORD OF THE
WHOLE CHRISTIAN WORLD.

CHAPTER IV: THE POPE DOES NOT HAVE ANY
TEMPORAL JURISDICTION DIRECTLY.

CHAPTER V: THE ARGUMENTS TO THE CONTRARY ARE
ANSWERED.

CHAPTER VI: THE POPE INDIRECTLY HOLDS
TEMPORAL POWER.

CHAPTER VII: THE TEACHING OF THE THEOLOGIAN IS
PROVEN BY REASON.

CHAPTER VIII: THE SAME THING IS PROVED BY
EXAMPLES.

CHAPTER IX: IT IS NOT OPPOSED WITH THE WORD OF
GOD THAT ONE MAN WOULD BE AN ECCLESIASTICAL
PRINCE AND A POLITICAL ONE AT THE SAME TIME

CHAPTER X: THE CONTRARY ARGUMENTS ARE
ANSWERED.

ON THE PRIMARY DUTY OF THE SOVEREIGN
PONTIFF

ON THE ROMAN PONTIFF

ST. ROBERT BELLARMINE, S.J.
Doctor of the Church



Vol. 2
Book 3-5

Translated from the original Latin

by
RYAN GRANT



MEDIATRIX PRESS

MMXVI

CONTENT INFORMATION

Translated from *De Controversiis Fidei Christiani, contra haereticos nostri temporis. De Romano Pontifice.*

Ingolstadt, 1588

Sartorius Publishers.

Revised according to the 1614 Paris edition, Tri-Adelphorum.

Second Edition, September 2017

First Edition, March 2016

Mediatrix Press

607 E. 6th St.

Post Falls, ID 83854

<http://www.mediatrixpress.com>

©Ryan Grant 2015, 2016, 2017.

All Rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced in physical or electronic format without the express permission of the publisher except for

quotations for review, articles, blogs or classroom use.

BOOK III: A DISPUTATION ON ANTICHRIST

CHAPTER I: A Disputation Is Proposed on Antichrist

Up to this point we have proved that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the supreme rule of the whole Church. It remains that we should see whether at some time the Roman Pontiff might have fallen from that degree; certainly our adversaries contend that at this time, there is not a true bishop of Rome, whatever he might have been before. Even Nilos Cabásilas of Thessalonika, at the end of his little book against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, says: “But the chief and principal point of my discourse is that as long as the Pope shall preserve the heavenly and agreeable order formerly instituted in the Church, as long as he shall adhere to Christ, the supreme Lord and head of the Church, I shall easily suffer him both as head of the Church and high Priest, even the successor of Peter or the Apostles; I will allow that all obey him, and that nothing should diminish that which pertains to his honor; but if he would have fallen from truth, nor wished to return to it, then rightly he ought to be held for one condemned and cast out.” Thus Nilos.

But he ought to have shown into what errors the Roman Pontiffs have fallen, as well as both when and by whom they were condemned. Certainly we know that in the General Council of the Lateran under Innocent III, Lyons under Gregory X, and Florence under Eugene IV, the Greeks were convicted of error and returned to the faith of the Latins. Thereafter, they always went back to their vomit, and for that reason were gravely punished by God. Yet we read nowhere that the Latins ever came to the faith of the Greeks. Nor can any ecclesiastical judgment be brought against the Latins, as we have brought many against the Greeks.

On the other hand, Calvin says: “Let us grant all these things are true (although we have already forced the contrary from them): Peter was constituted head of the universal Church by the voice of Christ, and that honor being conferred upon him, he laid down in the Roman See, and it was ratified by the authority of the ancient Church, confirmed by long use, that the Roman Pontiff always had supreme power over all, and was in his person the judge of all cases and men, and was subject to the judgment of none; let them have many more if they want. I respond that still, in one

word, it will avail them nothing, except that there ought to be a Church and a bishop in Rome.” [1](#) And below that: “Let the Romans untie this knot: I deny that the pontiff is the prince of bishops, since he is not really a bishop.” [2](#) And further: “Rome was rightly the mother of all churches once, but from the time it began to be the seat of Antichrist, it ceased to be that which it was.” [3](#) And again: “We appear to some to be cursed and petulant since we call the Roman Pontiff Antichrist; but they who think so do not understand that they charge Paul with immodesty, after whom we speak; nay more, we speak thus from his own mouth. And lest anyone would cast before us words of Paul which might pertain to another matter and wrongly distort them away from the Roman Pontiff, I will show briefly that it can be understood in no manner other than that the papacy is the seat of Antichrist.” [4](#)

All the heretics of this time teach similar things: Firstly, Luther, in his computation of the times, as well as in his *Assertions*, article 28 and 36, and often in other places. Likewise the Lutheran Centuriators in all of their *Centuries*; [5](#) Illyricus in his book on the Primacy; David Chytraeus in his work on the Apocalypse (the ninth and thirteenth chapters); Wolfgang Musculus in his work *de Ecclesia*, in common citations; Theodore Beza; [6](#) Theodore Bibliander; [7](#) Heinrich Pantaleon in his *Chronologia*; Henry Bullinger in his preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse, and above all, John Wycliff, who is among those condemned in article 30 of the Council of Constance, sess. 8. All of these pronounced that the Pontiff is the Antichrist.

Therefore, in order that this question should be carefully explained, it will be treated in nine chapters. The first will be on the name of Antichrist. The second on whether Antichrist might be one man, or a race of men. Thirdly, on the time of his coming and his death. Fourth, on his proper name. Fifth, from which nation he is going to be born, and especially by whom he will be received. Sixth, where he is going to set up his seat. Seventh, on his doctrine and morals. Eighth, on his miracles. Ninth, on his kingdom and battles. From all these it will appear very clearly with what impudence the heretics make the Roman Pontiff out to be the Antichrist, in which we will add a chapter proving not only that the Roman Pontiff is not

Antichrist, but that he could by no means cease to be the bishop and shepherd of the whole Church, and such that no part of the objections of Calvin shall remain unanswered.

Now in regard to the first, some of our adversaries teach that the name “Antichrist” properly means Vicar of Christ, and hence the Pope, who asserts he is the Vicar of Christ, is himself Antichrist. Wolfgang Musculus teaches this in his citations, in the chapter on the power of ministers, and he tries to show that the word *anti* means in place of, which is why *antichristos* is in place of Christ, just as *antistratēgos* means he who thrusts himself in place of a leader, that is, one who would have it that he is the vicar of a leader. The Centuriators also teach that the Pope is the true Antichrist because he makes himself the Vicar of Christ. But without a doubt they are deceived or are trying to deceive. The name “Antichrist” can not mean Vicar of Christ in any manner, rather, it merely means someone contrary to Christ; not contrary in any way whatever, but so much so that he will fight against that which pertains to the seat and dignity of Christ; that is, one who will be a rival of Christ and to be held as Christ, after he who truly is Christ has been cast out.

The meaning of this noun is proved in three ways. Firstly, because in Greek, the term *anti* properly means opposition, and they are said to be opposed not only to those among whom they oppose, but even those whom they exert influence over. From there, it comes to pass that *anti* in composition, sometimes means contrariety and sometimes equivalence but never subordination, as is clear in the examples of all such names. For instance, *antipalos* means imitation in mourning; *antidoton*, a contrary remedy; *antiphrasis*, contradiction; *antisrophos*, equivalence; *antitheos*, equal to God; *anticheiris*, that is the thumb, because from that region it is opposed and rules the rest of the hand, and so on and so forth. But “vicar” does not mean opposition but subordination to another thing, and therefore, cannot be expressed through the term *anti*.

Hence, the term *antistratēgos* does not mean the vicar of a leader but ordinarily a contrary leader, just as *antisratenomai*, is a civil war. Moreover, sometimes one who is in place of a leader is not subject to him but rather equal to him in the way that the Latin words *Propraetor*, or *Proconsul*, do not mean the vicar of a praetor, or a consul, but one who is in some province, like that which a praetor or a consul is in the city. And in this Musculus was deceived because he read with Budaeus that *antistratēgos*

means a *propraetor*, and he reckoned it meant vicar of a praetor, which is false.

Secondly, the same is proven from Scripture. Although there is some ambiguity about this noun still, as it is received in Scripture it is not ambiguous; our question ought not to be on the term *antichristos* in an absolute sense, but as it is found in the Scriptures. Next, in the Scriptures the one who is called Antichrist is he: “who is extolled above everything which is called God.” [8](#) That is certainly not a Vicar of Christ but an enemy of Christ, the true God. In the First Epistle of John, Antichrist is said to be he “who denies Jesus is the Messiah,” [9](#) i.e. he who denies Jesus is the Christ, that he would claim for himself that which is for Christ. And in Matthew, it is said that Antichrist will affirm himself to be Christ, [10](#) which can hardly be a vicar but rather would be an imitator.

Thirdly, from all the authors who wrote on Antichrist and from the common consensus of all Christians, we understand by “Antichrist” a certain man as a distinct Pseudochrist. This is how St. John Damascene explains this term from the Greek Fathers, [11](#) and in the same manner Jerome explains it from the Latin Fathers, [12](#) and he was also an expert in the Greek language.

Lastly, Henry Stephan gives a similar explanation in his *Treasury on the Greek Language*, albeit he is from the number of the Swiss heretics. Thus, we have our first argument against our adversaries. Since the noun “Antichrist” means an enemy and imitator of Christ, and the Roman Pontiff is from the household of Christ, declaring that he is subject to Christ in all things, it is clear that he would in no way say he is Christ, or that he makes himself equal to him; therefore, it is manifest that he is not Antichrist.

CHAPTER II: Antichrist Is Going To Be a Certain, Specific Man

NOW in what pertains to the second, we agree with our adversaries in one thing and differ in another. We agree in the fact that just as the name of Christ is received in two ways, sometimes properly concerning the specific and individual person of Christ, who is Jesus of Nazareth, and sometimes commonly concerning all those who have a similitude with Christ in regard to anointing, just as all priests, prophets and kings are said to be of Christ: “Do not touch my Christs;” [13](#) so also Antichrist is received properly sometimes for a certain distinct enemy of Christ, on which the Scriptures teach, and sometimes commonly for all who oppose Christ in some way. We read in the First Epistle of John: “You have heard, that Antichrist is coming, and now there are many Antichrists;” [14](#) in other words, you have heard Antichrist is going to come, and now, although that singular Antichrist has not yet come, still many seducers have come who also can be called Antichrists.

But we differ on Antichrist properly so called, whether he might be one individual man. All Catholics think that Antichrist is one specific man; but all the heretics cited above teach that Antichrist, properly so called, is not a single person but a single throne of a tyrannical kingdom as well as the seat of its apostasy that presides over the Church.

The Centuriators say: “The Apostles teach that Antichrist is not only one person, but a whole kingdom through false teachers in the temple of God that is presiding in the Church, in a great city, i.e. the city of Rome, whose works are compared to the deception and deceit of the devil.” [15](#) The others we cited say similar things.

These are their reasons. First, Paul says that already in his time Antichrist began to live in the world: “The mystery of iniquity is now operating,” [16](#) and still he says in the same place that Antichrist must be killed by Christ at the end of the world. Hence, Beza concludes in his

commentary on this citation in Thessalonians that: “They are clearly hallucinating when they think this can be understood about one man; unless they give me someone who remains alive from the age of Paul even to the day of judgment.” Calvin argues in the same way from this passage. They confirm this reasoning from John who, in his First Epistle, says: “Every spirit that denies Jesus, it is not from God and this is Antichrist whom you have heard is coming, and is now in the world.” [17](#)

The second reason is of Beza: because Daniel 7 does not understand individuals by the individual names of the beasts of bear, lion and leopard, but rather individual kingdoms, one of which contains many kings. Therefore, Paul, who wondrously agrees with Daniel, does not understand the man of sin and the son of perdition as one individual person but a figure as a body of many tyrants.

The third reason is of Calvin who argues from what is said in 1 John 2 that those who believe that one man is going to be Antichrist are mad and err of their own accord, since Paul in 2 Thessalonians 2 wrote that apostasy was coming and his head is going to be Antichrist. Accordingly, apostasy is a certain general defection from the faith which indeed makes one body and one rule, and is not a matter of a few years that it could be completed under one king.

With all of these notwithstanding, the truth is that Antichrist is one individual man. The fact is proven from all the Scriptures and the Fathers who treat on Antichrist. There are five passages of Scripture. The first is in the Gospel of John: “I have come in the name of my Father, and you did not receive me, if another will have come in his own name, you will receive him.” [18](#) Musculus and Calvin would have these words on false prophets understood in general, not on some individual, following Marloratus in his commentary on this passage. But their explication is opposed to the ancient Fathers and the text itself. For these words were spoken on one Antichrist, as Chrysostom, Cyril and all the Fathers witness on this citation. [19](#)

Besides this, the Lord opposes himself to another man, i.e. person to person, not kingdom to kingdom or sect to sect, as is clear from the pronouns and phrases: “I,” another “in my name,” that is in his own name, “me,” etc. Therefore, just as Christ was one and an individual man, so also Antichrist will be one and an individual man.

Next, Christ says here that Antichrist will be received by the Jews for a Messiah. Moreover, it is certain that the Jews wait for one certain and singular man. All false prophets come not in their own name but in that of another. “Prophets that falsely prophesy in my name, these are not sent, etc.” [20](#) But the Lord spoke about one specific man who will come in his own name, that is, who does not recognize some God, but “will extol himself,” as Paul says, “over everything which is called God.”

Next, many false prophets came before the coming of Christ and many were going to come after. Therefore, if he were speaking on false prophets the Lord would not have said: “If another will have come,” but that many are coming.

The second passage is of Paul. “Unless first dissension will have come, and the man of sin will have been revealed, the son of perdition ... And then that wicked man will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will kill by the breath of his mouth.” [21](#) Our adversaries understand these words on the true Antichrist, but the Apostle speaks on a certain specific and particular person, as is clear from the articles in the Greek: “*apochaluphthē ho anthrōpos tēs amartias ho huios tēs apōleias ... kai tote apochaluphthēsetai ho anomos*,” as Epiphanius teaches, the Greek articles draw together the meaning to one certain matter, that *anthrōpos* will mean a man in common but *ho anthrōpos* an individual man. [22](#) It is quite the wonder, that none of our adversaries who boast of their expertise in language happened to notice this.

The third citation is that of 1 John 2, where we read thus: “*hēkousate hoti ho antichristos epektai kai nun antikrisoi polloi gegonasin*” or, “You have heard that *the* Antichrist is coming, and now there are many Antichrists.” There, he places an article ahead of Antichrist properly so called, but without the article it would convey the name of Antichrist received commonly, clearly indicating that Antichrist properly so called is one certain person while Antichrist commonly received is not a certain person, but every heretic in kind.

The fourth passage is from Daniel chapter 7, 11 and 12, where he speaks on Antichrist, which Jerome and Theodoret as well as other Fathers teach on this passage, [23](#) and even Calvin, the Centuriators, and Beza in their citations above. Moreover, in Daniel, Antichrist is not called one kingdom

but one specific king from ten kings whom he will discover in the world; he will altogether abolish three from the midst and subject the other seven to himself. Add what Calvin says, that Daniel speaks literally on Antiochus Epiphanies [24](#) and allegorically on Antichrist whose figure was Antiochus, which Cyprian and Jerome also teach. [25](#) But Antiochus Epiphanus was a certain specific and singular person; therefore, Antichrist ought also to be a certain, specific person.

The fifth and last passage is in the book of the Apocalypse 13 and 17. Such passages are understood on Antichrist, as Irenaeus teaches, and it is clear from the similarity of the words to those places in Daniel and John. Each make mention of ten kings who will be on the earth when Antichrist will come and each predicts that the kingdom of Antichrist is going to endure for three and a half years. Just as Daniel speaks on one king so does John in the book of the Apocalypse.

The same is proven from the Fathers who teach in a common consensus on Antichrist. Firstly, that he will be the chosen instrument of the Devil to the extent that a plenitude of diabolic malice will inhabit him corporally, just as in Christ the man the plenitude of divinity dwelled in him corporally. Secondly, Antichrist will not reign more than three and a half years, and hence they teach Antichrist is going to be only one man. [26](#)

Now I shall respond to the first argument of Beza: In the time of the Apostles Antichrist began to live secretly, but not in his own person, rather in his precursors. Just as Christ began to come from the origin of the world in the patriarchs and prophets (who came before him and signified him so that it could be said the mystery of godliness began to operate from the beginning of the world), he did not come in his own proper person until the time when he received flesh from the Blessed Virgin Mary. In like manner, Antichrist began to come soon after Christ was assumed into heaven in his precursors, and the mystery of iniquity began to work, namely in heretics and tyrants persecuting the Church; especially in Simon Magus, who said he was Christ, and in Nero who first began to oppose the Church. Just the same, he will not come in his own person until the end of the world. Therefore, the spiritual persecution of Simon Magus and the temporal persecution of Nero is called the mystery of iniquity because they were signs and figures of the persecution of Antichrist.

That this is the true explication of the Pauline passages can be shown in two ways. Firstly, from all the interpreters of this passage. Certainly, all understood through the mystery of iniquity in Paul either the persecution of Nero, as Ambrose and Chrysostom on this citation, as well as Jerome; [27](#) or heretics who secretly deceive, as Theodoret and Sedulius remark on this verse along with Augustine. [28](#)

Secondly, from reason, taken from the admission of our adversaries who say that Antichrist is properly the seat of the Roman Pontiff.

Therefore, if Antichrist, properly so called, was born in the time of the Apostles, it follows that Peter and Paul were properly said to be Antichrists, although in secret, and Nero and Simon Magus were the true Christ. It is certain that in the time of the Apostles there were no other bishops at Rome than Peter and Paul. Irenaeus eloquently affirms that the Roman See was founded by Peter and Paul and that they sat there as its first bishops. [29](#) All the Fathers whom we cited in the last book teach the same thing. It is also certain that Simon Magus and Nero battled with the Apostles Peter and Paul.

But if this does not please our adversaries, that Peter and Paul were Antichrists and Simon and Nero the true Christ, they are compelled to affirm that Antichrist did not exist in the time of the Apostles *per se*, rather only in his specific type. The consequence of that makes Beza's point, that Antichrist could not be one man unless we would grant that he lived from the time of the Apostles even to the end of the world, utterly ridiculous.

To confirm this, I say John spoke in that mode in which the Lord spoke on Elijah: "Elijah indeed is going to come and he will restore all things but I say to you that Elijah already came, and they did not recognize him." [30](#) In other words, Elijah was going to come in his own person but he already came in one like him, that is John the Baptist.

Now to the Second argument. In the first place, we must deny that Daniel always understands individual kingdoms for individual beasts. For sometimes he means one kingdom for one beast, as in chapter 7 where he understands the kingdom of the Assyrians for the lion; the kingdom of the Persians for the bear; the empire of the Greeks for the leopard; and through another unnamed beast the empire of the Romans. Sometimes he understands one king, as in the eighth chapter where he understands King

Darius, the last king of the Persians, through the ram and Alexander the Great through the goat. Next, the consequent of the argument is denied. For Paul understands for “the man of sin” not someone from the four beasts described by Daniel, but that little horn which, in Daniel, prevails over the ten horns of the four beasts, i.e., that one king who rose from modest circumstances to subjugate all other kings to himself.

I respond to the final argument in several ways to show how impudent Calvin is when he writes that those who do not gather from his argument that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist err from their own will. Firstly, Antichrist can correctly be understood through “apostasy” in Paul’s citation. Thus, the Greek interpreters understand it in a common consensus. [31](#)

Moreover, Antichrist is called apostasy both through metonym, [32](#) because the case will be that many will recede from God, and through a certain excellence; there will be a characteristic apostasy that can be called apostasy itself.

Secondly, Apostasy can be taken up as the defection from the Roman Empire, as many Latins explain. [33](#) For as we will show in the following chapter, Antichrist will not come until the Roman Empire shall altogether fall to ruin.

Thirdly, if we were to admit that through apostasy defection from the true faith and religion of Christ is understood (as Calvin claims), still we would not be constrained by difficulties on that account. For Paul did not necessarily speak of the apostasy of many ages; he could speak on a certain great and singular apostasy that will only be in that brief time in which Antichrist will reign. St. Augustine writes that he was also understood in this way by many of the Fathers, and they taught that when Antichrist appears all secret heretics or false Christians will go to him and from that event the greatest apostasy is going to occur, such as had never been before.

Fourthly, if we were to concede to Calvin that St. Paul speaks on the apostasy of many ages, he still gains nothing. Accordingly, we would be able say that apostasy does not necessarily pertain to one body and kingdom of Antichrist, nor demands one head, but is a defection to the kingdom of Antichrist that will happen in different places, under different kings and on different occasions. We now see that Africa defected to Muhammad, a great part of Asia to Nestorius and the Monophysites, and other provinces to other sects.

Fifthly and lastly, if we were to grant to Calvin a general Apostasy from the faith and that the kingdom of Antichrist endured for many years, it would not immediately follow that the Pope is Antichrist. For it still might be asked whether certain men have defected from the faith and religion of Christ; it could be us or them, that is, Catholics or Lutherans. Although they say we are the ones who have defected, nevertheless, they have not yet proved it, nor has it been declared by any common judge.

We can much more easily prove that it is the Lutherans that are the ones that defected than they can prove Catholics defected. Accordingly, they defected from the Church in which they were first and they do not even deny it. For (that I might pass over the rest), when Erasmus of Rotterdam says on that passage of 2 Thessalonians 2: "Then that wicked man will be revealed," he ingeniously confesses that nearly all the predecessors of the Lutherans and himself at one time obeyed the Roman Pontiff. Therefore, they defected from the Church and religion of their predecessors. On the other hand, they have not shown to this point that we have defected from some Church, nor could they ever show it. Therefore, since they read Paul: "Until a dissension will come, or apostasy and that wicked man will be revealed, etc.," and they know they have left the Church in which they were, while we have persevered in the same one that was always established, it is a wonder that they do not at least fear lest Paul might have spoken about them.

From this second chapter we have the second argument: to prove that the Pope is not the Antichrist. Therefore, if Antichrist is one person, yet there were and will be many Popes provided with the same dignity and power, then certainly Antichrist must be sought somewhere other than in the Roman See.

CHAPTER III: It Is Shown That Antichrist Has Not Yet Come.

MANY false suspicions and errors exist in regard to the third proposition, on the time of the coming of Antichrist both among Catholics and heretics. Yet with this distinction, Catholics know that Antichrist is not coming until the end of the world (which is true), but some err in that they think the end of the world is nearer than it really may be. On the other hand, the heretics err in the fact that they think Antichrist is coming long before the end of the world, and that he really already has come. Therefore, we shall speak on each error.

In the first place, all the Fathers who noticed the malice of their times suspected that the times of Antichrist approached. Thus the Thessalonians thought in the time of the Apostles that the day of the Lord approached, which the Apostle corrected in 2 Thessalonians 2. Likewise, St. Cyprian says: "Since Antichrist threatens, let the soldiers be prepared for battle, etc."

[34](#) He also says in another epistle: "You ought to know, as well as believe and hold for a certain fact, that the day of persecution of the head has begun, and the end of the world and time of Antichrist approaches." [35](#) Jerome says: "He who held fast arises in our midst and we do not understand that Antichrist approaches?" [36](#) St. Gregory the Great: "All which has been predicted comes to pass; the proud king is near." [37](#) Gregory also boldly pronounced the end of the world. [38](#) But these were suspicions, not errors, since these holy Fathers did not dare to define a certain time.

Next, others more boldly constituted a certain time. St. Jerome relates in *de illustribus viris* that in 200 A.D., a certain Jude thought Antichrist was coming and the world was ending; clearly he was deceived. Again Lactantius says: "Every expectation is no more than two hundred years, etc." [39](#) There he teaches that Antichrist was coming and the world was to

end two hundred years from his time. He also lived in the times of Constantine, around the 300th year of Christ; so he thought the world would by chance end in the year 500; but experience shows he was also deceived.

St. Augustine relates the error of some who said that the world would end around the year 400 from the ascension of the Lord, [40](#) and also some who established the thousandth year. They were all deceived. It also happened even to the Pagans, who, as Augustine witnesses in the same book, gathered from I know not what divine oracle that the Christian religion would only endure for three hundred and sixty five years. There was a certain bishop, Florentinus by name, who asserted around the year 1105 that Antichrist had already been born, and hence the end of the world was closing in. The Council of Florence, having three hundred and forty bishops, was gathered for this reason by Pope Paschal II. [41](#)

Next, there was also a famous opinion that had many defenders, [42](#) that the world was going to endure for 6,000 years, since God had created the world in six days, and a thousand years is to God one day. The writers of the Talmud also agree with this opinion, and they say that they had a vision of the Prophet Elijah in which it is asserted that the world will endure for six thousand years.

This opinion cannot yet be refuted from experience, because according to the true chronology more or less 5600 years have elapsed since the beginning of the world. Ambrose rejects this opinion, asserting in his time that six thousand years had already elapsed, though obviously he is misled.

[43](#) The moderation of St. Augustine is the best, since he thought the opinion probable, and followed it as probable. [44](#) From here, it does not follow that we know the last day. Moreover, we say it is probable, that the world will not endure beyond six thousand years, but we do not say that it is certain. On that account, St. Augustine bitterly rebuked those who asserted that the world is going to end at a certain time, when the Lord said: "It is not for us to know the time and the hour which the Father has placed in his power." [45](#) Laying all these aside, let us come to the heretics.

All the heretics of this time teach that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, and now openly lives in the world, but they do not agree among themselves on the time in which he appeared. They have six opinions.

The First are the Samosatens, who bide their time in Hungary and Transylvania. They teach in a certain book which they titled: *Premonitions of Christ and the Apostles on the abolition of Christ through Antichrist*, that a little after the times of the Apostles Antichrist appeared; that is without a doubt when it began to be preached that Christ is the eternal son of God. They think, on the other hand, that Christ is a pure man, and that there is only one person in God, and this faith was preached by Christ and the Apostles. Thus, a little after the death of the Apostles, Antichrist came to Rome and after abolishing Christ the pure man, introduced another eternal Christ, and made God triune, and Christ twofold.

This opinion is easily refuted, apart from the arguments which we asserted above against all the heretics, and in two ways. Firstly, because when Antichrist will have come, *he will make himself God*, not someone else, as the Apostle says. [46](#) Moreover, they themselves claim that the Roman Pontiff does not make himself God, but preached Christ and made him God from a true man. Secondly, because they say that soon after Christ and the Apostles slept, the true faith of Christ was thoroughly extinguished and the whole world began to worship Christ as God. But Christ preached that the gates of hell were not going to prevail against the Church, and the Angel Gabriel preached that the kingdom of Christ would be forever. [47](#) David preached that all kings would serve Christ. [48](#) Therefore, how true is it that in the very beginning the nascent Church was destroyed by Antichrist?

The second opinion is of the Lutheran, Illyricus, who teaches in his Third *Catalogue* that Antichrist came when the Roman Empire fell into ruin. Moreover, it is certain that the Roman Empire began to fall after the tenth year of Honorius, when Rome was first taken, that is in the year of the Lord 412, as Blondus showed; [49](#) yet, Illyricus seems to understand this concerning the conception, not the birth of Antichrist. Accordingly he teaches the same thing in the *Centuries*, [50](#) that Antichrist was conceived in some manner at the beginning of the year 400, thereafter animated and formed in the womb of his mother, around the year 500; and at length was born in the year 606, when the Eastern Emperor Phocas conceded to the Roman Pontiff that he could be called head of the whole Church. He teaches the same thing in another place, that Antichrist was going to rule

savagely with the spiritual sword for 1260 years, but with the temporal sword for 666 years, and then the end of the world would come.

The first number he gathers from Apocalypse 11, where it is said the time of Antichrist would be 1260 days. Illyricus would have it that a day is taken as a year. The second number he gathers from Apocalypse 13, where the number of the beast is 666.

This opinion can be refuted in two ways. Firstly, it follows that Antichrist was not only born but also died, and hence the end of the world already came. For the Roman Pontiff took up the temporal sword, that is temporal dominion, at least in the year 699. Then Aripertus gave to the Roman Pontiff the Coctian Alps, where Genoa is now. Later, in the year 714, Luitprandus confirmed that donation, as Ado of Vienna and Blondus affirm, not to mention the Centuriators and Theodore Bibliander, who remarked for the year 714 that this province became the first Papist province.

Not long after, that is, in the year 760, Pepin gave the Exarchate of Ravenna to the Roman Pontiffs, along with a great part of Italy as many historians witness—even the Centuriators and Bibliander. Therefore, if Antichrist began to reign in the year 760, and endured for 666 years, then the end of the world happened in the year of Christ 1421, and now there have been more than 150 years after Antichrist died. But if the beginning of his reign is placed earlier, that is in the year 699, then the end will be placed in the year 1360 and now more than 200 years will have transpired from the death of Antichrist.

Perhaps they will respond that after the 666th year of his reign Antichrist did not die but only lost his temporal dominion. Thus, they might say that the spiritual kingdom of Antichrist endured for 1260 years, which still would not have ended, and if they were to begin from the year 666, consequently they ought to say that the spiritual kingdom of antichrist ought to endure considerably beyond his temporal kingdom. But that is certainly absurd and against all authors, and besides, it at least follows that the Popes ought to have lost their temporal dominion 200 years ago, which is opposed to the obvious fact.

Secondly, the same error can be refuted because it follows from the error of the Centuriators, who thought they discovered exactly when the world will end, which is against the words of the Lord in Acts I and Matthew 24. What should follow is clear since, if they know that Antichrist began to

reign with the spiritual sword in the year 606, they know that he was going to reign only 1260 years and then the Lord is going to come to judge right after, as they gather from Paul in 2 Thessal. 2. Therefore, they know the last judgment is going to be in the year 1466. But if they do not know this, they are compelled also to not know whether Antichrist has come.

The third opinion is of David Chytraeus who teaches with Illyricus in his commentary on chapter 9 of the Apocalypse, namely that Antichrist appeared around the year of the Lord 600, and that this is sufficient to show that St. Gregory was the first Antichrist Pope. Chytraeus, however, does not agree with that which is asserted by Illyricus, insofar as the time and duration of Antichrist, but he prudently advises that it is not to be defined so boldly. He attempts to show with three reasons that Antichrist appeared in the year 600.

Firstly, because in that time Gregory established the invocation of the saints and Masses for the dead. Secondly, because in the year 606, Pope Boniface III asked the title of universal bishop from the Emperor Phocas. He adds the third reason in his commentary on chapter 13, that this time plainly and especially agrees with the number of the name of Antichrist, 666 as it is contained in the Apocalypse, ch. 13.

Furthermore, Chytraeus adds that from this same number of the name Antichrist the time can be gathered wherein Pepin confirmed the reign of Antichrist. For as many years as there are from the year 97 in which John wrote the Apocalypse even to Pepin is without a doubt 666 years. Likewise, Jan Hus reckons the time from when the Roman Pontiff was declared Antichrist back to Pepin to be almost 666.

This opinion can be easily refuted, as it rests upon frauds alone. For in the first place Gregory was not the first who invoked saints and taught that Masses were to be offered up for the dead. All the Fathers taught this very thing as we showed in another place. For the present Ambrose suffices, who preceded Gregory by 200 years. He says in his book on widows: “The angels are to be observed, the martyrs prayed to.” [51](#) He also says in his epistle to Faustus on the death of his sister: “Therefore, I deem that she is not to be wept for with tears but pursued with prayers; you ought not grieve for her but commend her soul to God with offerings.” [52](#)

Next, Phocas did not give the title of “universal” to the Pope but addressed him as head of the churches. Even Justinian had already done the

same long before, in an epistle to John II, and before that the Council of Chalcedon had done so in an epistle to Leo I. Therefore, there is simply no reason to place the coming of Antichrist in the time of the Emperor Phocas.

As to what Chytraeus adds on the number 666, it is altogether inept because that number does not agree precisely with the times that he would have it Antichrist appeared, or was confirmed, or declared to be so. For from Christ to the sanction of Phocas there are 607 years, not 666. From the revelation in the Apocalypse to Pepin 658 years, and from Pepin to Jan Hus there are, as he says, 640. But certainly John the Apostle in the Apocalypse recorded a precise number since he also adds minute details. Moreover, Jan Hus was not the first to declare that the Pope is Antichrist; Wycliff had already done that. Nay more, Jan Hus never even said that the Pope is Antichrist. For in art. 19 of the Council of Constance, after being condemned, he says that the clergy, through their avarice, prepare the way for Antichrist. Next, all Lutherans boast that Luther was the first to unmask Antichrist, which brings us to the next opinion.

The fourth opinion is of Luther in his computation of time, where he places two arrivals of Antichrist. One, with the spiritual sword, after the year 600, when Phocas called the Roman Pontiff the head of all churches. He also says that Gregory was the last Roman Pontiff. The second is when he arrives with the temporal sword after the year 1000. Bibliander teaches the same thing. [53](#) Therefore, Luther and Bibliander agree in the first arrival with the Centuriators and Chytraeus—with the exception that Luther and Bibliander say that Gregory was a good and holy Pope while the Centuriators and Chytraeus say that Gregory above all did his best to introduce Antichrist and hence, he was the worst Pope, which is a horrendous blasphemy. In the second arrival, Luther and the Centuriators clearly disagree.

This opinion, apart from the common arguments which will be made afterward, is easily refuted. Luther places the arrival of Antichrist in the year 600 and 1000 altogether without reason. On the year 600 we have already spoken in refutation of Chytraeus. Concerning the year 1000, it can easily be shown, since Luther places the beginning of the temporal reign of Antichrist in that time when Pope Gregory VIII deposed the Emperor Henry IV, for then he ruled temporally as well as waged wars. Well now, all of these things already happened, as Gregory II excommunicated the [Byzantine] Emperor Leo, and deprived him of the rule of Italy in the year

715, as the historians Cedreno and Zonaras witness in the life of the same Leo. Furthermore, we already showed that the Roman Pontiffs had temporal dominion in the year 700, three hundred years before the first millennium.

Next, the Centuriators witness that Stephen III waged wars around the year 750, [54](#) and Adrian I could be said to have done the same thing, as well as other of their successors. In like manner, around the year 850, Leo IV, a holy man as well as famous for miracles, waged war against the Saracens. He reported a singular victory and fortified Rome with towers and ramparts still; he girded the Vatican hill with a wall, which thereafter was called after his name *civitas Leonina*, as nearly all historians of that time relate, and even the Centuriators themselves. [55](#)

The fifth opinion is of Henry Bullinger. In the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse he wrote that Antichrist appeared in the year 753. Such an opinion disagrees with all those whom we cited above, and thence can easily be refuted because it rests upon a very weak foundation. Bullinger teaches in the Apocalypse, ch. 13, that the number found there of the name of the Beast, 666, means by that number the time of the arrival of Antichrist; in other words, so many years after the Apocalypse was written, Antichrist was going to come. And because it is certain from Irenaeus that the Apocalypse was written around the end of the reign of the Emperor Domitian, i.e., around the year 97, he gathers Antichrist was going to come in the year 753, by computing 666 years from the year 97.

To this point the opinion of certain Catholics can also be related, such as Jodocus Clichovaeus, who reckoned from the commentaries of St. John Damascene [56](#) that Muhammad was Antichrist properly so called because he came around the year 666 according to what John had said before. But this reasoning amounts to nothing. In the first place, the Centuriators contend that the number in the book of the Apocalypse does not mean the time of the birth of Antichrist, but of his death. Moreover, John the Evangelist, in chapter 13 of the Apocalypse, rejects the commentary both of Illyricus and Bullinger, since he explains that the number is not of the times but the name of Antichrist; i.e. Antichrist is going to have a name, whose letters in Greek form the number 666, as Irenaeus and all other Fathers explain. Besides, no change is read in the Roman Pontiffs for that year 753. Moreover, Muhammad could not come then since he was born in the year 597 and began to call himself a prophet in the year 623. He died in the year

632, as Palmerius witnesses in his *Chronicle*. Thus, he did not make it to the year 666.

The sixth opinion is of Wolfgang Musculus, who in his works under the title *de Ecclesia*, ch. 24, affirms that Antichrist came a little after the times of St. Bernard, i.e. around the year 1200. His argument is St. Bernard enumerates many vices of men, and especially of churchmen, and very serious persecutions of the Church, adding: “It remains only for the man of sin to be revealed.” [57](#) But this opinion is refuted without much effort: St. Bernard merely suspected from the evils which he saw that Antichrist was near, as we said many Fathers suspected it from their times, namely Cyprian, Jerome and Gregory; Bernard was deceived in that suspicion just as they. Besides, the Popes from the year 900 to 1000 were without comparison worse than the Popes from 1100 to 1200. So if the former were not Antichrist, why would the latter be?

CHAPTER IV: The First Proof: The Rule of Antichrist Has Not Yet Begun.

HEREFORE, the true opinion is that Antichrist has not yet begun to reign, nor come, rather he is going to come and rule around the end of the world. Yet, inasmuch as he has not yet come he cannot be known. This opinion destroys all those mentioned above and clearly shows that the Roman Pontiffs are not Antichrists. It is proven by six reasons.

It must be known that the Holy Spirit gave us six certain signs of the arrival of Antichrist in the Scriptures: Two preceding Antichrist, namely preaching of the Gospel and the desolation of the Roman Empire; two accompanying it, certainly the preaching of Enoch and Elijah, and a great and remarkable persecution, so much that public religion would altogether cease; two subsequent signs, namely the desolation of Antichrist after three and a half years and then the end of the world, which we see presently still exists.

Hence, the first proof is taken from the first sign preceding Antichrist. The Scriptures witness that in the whole world the Gospel must be preached before the last persecution will come, which will be roused by Antichrist: "This Gospel of the kingdom in testimony to the whole world, in witness to all the Gentiles." [58](#) The fact that this should happen before the arrival of Antichrist can be proved by this reason: because in the time of Antichrist the cruelty of that last persecution will impede all public exercise of the true religion.

Yet, because our adversaries do not admit this reasoning (nor is it now the time to deduce from their own principles), we will prove it from the testimonies of the Fathers. Thus Hilary explains these words of Matthew: "The Gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world, and then the consummation will come." Clearly he teaches that Antichrist, which he calls the abomination of desolation, is not going to come unless the preaching of the Gospel will precede him throughout the whole world.

St. Cyril, Theodoret, and St. John Damascene teach the same thing with eloquent words, [59](#) and besides, the same is gathered from the text because the Gospel says that before that greatest and last tribulation shall come, the Gospel must be preached such as it was not before nor will be afterward. The Fathers and above all, St. Augustine, teach that the persecution of Antichrist is meant by such a tribulation. [60](#) Yet the Gospel was not preached in the whole world in the time that the new Samosatens say Antichrist came, that is around the year 200 or 300. It is clear from Origen, who asserted at that time the Gospel was not yet preached everywhere. [61](#) Likewise from Ruffinus, who witnesses that in the time of Constantine the Emperor, that is, after the year 300, that the Gospel was preached in the furthest parts of India, since before they had never heard anything about Christ. [62](#) Next, we learn it from St. Augustine who says with some experience one would find that there were many nations in his time that had not yet heard anything about Christ. [63](#)

Now, it is clear that the preaching of the Gospel was not completed around the year 600 or 700, in which the Centuriators, Chytraeus, Luther and Bullinger place the arrival of Antichrist. This is so from the conversion of the Vandals, the Poles, the Moravians and similar nations, who it is certain had not heard the preaching of the Gospel until after the year 800, as the Centuriators themselves affirm in their histories. [64](#) Likewise, the preaching of the Gospel had not been completed in the times of St. Bernard, where Wolfgang Musculus places the arrival of Antichrist. This is clear from Bernard himself, who asserts in book 3 of *de Consideratione* that still in his time there were nations who had not heard the Gospel.

Next, experience teaches that even in our time the Gospel has not been preached in the whole world. Very vast regions were discovered in both the East and West in which no memory of the Gospel exists. Nor can it be said the faith was ever there but later extinguished, for at least some vestige would remain, either there or in the writings of the Fathers. Besides, we know where all the Apostles preached and the places were marked by many, though I would not say by all; but the new world was recently discovered; it was not known in Apostolic times or any other until a little before our age.

Only one objection can be made against this proof: That perhaps Scripture, when it says the Gospel must be preached in the whole world, does not speak absolutely but rather receives the whole for a part by a figure of speech, just as Luke 2 when it is said: “An edict went out from Caesar Augustus that the whole world should be enrolled.” Otherwise what Paul says would be false, that already in his time: “The sound of the Apostles has gone out through all the earth,” [65](#) as well as what he says in Colossians: “The truth of the Gospel which has arrived even to you, just as it bears fruit and increases in the whole world... which has been preached to every creature which is under heaven.” [66](#)

I respond: Without a doubt it is not through a figure that the Gospel ought to be preached and churches constituted, but properly and absolutely in the whole world, that is in every nation. In the first place, St. Augustine expressly teaches this, [67](#) as well as the other fathers we have cited, such as Origen and Jerome in their commentaries on Matthew 24.

Next, it can be proved by three reasons. 1) Christ said preaching in the whole world is a sign of the consummation of the age. Therefore, he adds: “And then the consummation will come.” But if this is not properly, but synecdochically that the Gospel ought to be preached in the whole world, it avails to nothing as a sign. For in the first 20 years the Gospel was preached by the Apostles in the whole world. 2) Secondly, as Augustine reasons, all nations were properly promised to Christ; “All nations will serve him.” [68](#) Christ generally died for all and as a result (as related in Apocalypse 7), the elect will be described as being from all nations, peoples, tribes and tongues. Therefore, even preaching properly ought to be general. For that reason, in Matthew 24 it is said that the Gospel must be preached in the whole world, “in testimony to all nations;” that is, lest any nation could be excused in the day of judgment for its infidelity on account of ignorance. So, before the general judgment, general preaching ought to precede.

Augustine responds to those passages of Paul in Epistle 80, and says that Paul, when he spoke in Romans 10, received the past for the future, just as David did who uses the same words. Moreover, when he says in Colossians: “The Gospel is in the whole world,” he did not wish to say it was in act but in potency, because without a doubt the seed of the Divine Word was thrown out by the Apostles in the whole world, so that little by little in

bearing fruit and increasing it was going to fill the whole world. Just in the same way that someone could suppose the flame from different parts of the city could truly be said to burn the whole of that city because the fire was applied little by little by burning and was going to take up the whole city; this is the same thing the Apostle indicates when he says: “In the whole world it is bearing fruit and increasing.” Therefore, it did not plainly overtake the whole world since still it had to be propagated, but still has seized it in some way—that is, in potency not in act.

A response can be made with Jerome and St. Thomas that the Gospel arrived to the nations in two ways: in one way through report; in another through proper preachers and the foundation of churches. Indeed, in the first manner the Gospel arrived to all the Nations of the whole world then known in the time of the Apostles and in this way Paul could speak. Chrysostom should also be understood in the same way on Matthew 24. In the second manner it could not have arrived then but was going to in its own time, and on this the Lord speaks in Matthew 24 as well as in the last Chapter of Luke and Acts 1.

3) Lastly, add that it is not absurd were we to concede the Lord spoke properly but the Apostle figuratively, whereby we would be compelled to take the words of the Lord in their own meaning; they do not have the same force if they were to be accommodated to the words of St. Paul, especially when the Lord spoke on the future, while Paul spoke on the past.

CHAPTER V: The Second Proof: Desolation of the Roman Empire

THE SECOND proof is taken from another sign that will precede the times of Antichrist, which will be the *desolation* in every way possible of the Roman Empire. At length, it must be known that the Roman Empire was divided into ten kings, none of whom will be called “King of the Romans,” although all will occupy some provinces of the Roman Empire in the same way that the King of France, the King of Spain, the Queen of England and by chance some others hold parts of the Roman Empire; at length they are not Roman kings or emperors, but until they cease to hold those dominions Antichrist cannot come.

Irenaeus [69](#) proves this from Daniel, chapters 2 and 7, as well as from chapter 17 of the Apocalypse. In Daniel there is a description of particular kingdoms even to the end of the world, and a certain one is described whose golden head signifies the first kingdom, that is, of the Assyrians; its silver chest is the second kingdom, that is of Persia; the bronze mid-section is the third kingdom, that is of the Hellenistic Empires; the iron legs represent the fourth kingdom, that is of Rome. Now Rome was divided into two parts for a very long time, just as there are two legs and they are the longest part of the body. Next, ten toes arose from the two legs, and with these the whole statue ended; certainly this means that the Roman Empire was divided into ten kings, none of whom will be king of the Romans, just as no toe is the leg. But now, in chapter 7, Daniel clearly marks out through the four beasts the same four kingdoms which mean the last ten kings who will arise from the Roman Empire, yet they will not be Roman emperors; just as the horns begin from the beast but are not the beast itself.

John describes a beast with seven heads and ten horns, upon which a certain woman sat, and explains the woman is a great city which sits upon seven hills, that is Rome; [70](#) the seven heads are those seven mountains, and also the seven kings, by which number all the Roman emperors are understood. He says the ten horns are ten kings that will rule together at one

time, and lest we think these by chance will be Roman kings, he adds that these kings will hate the harlot and will make desolation, because they will so divide the Roman Empire among themselves that they will almost destroy it.

Next, Paul proves the same thing in 2 Thessal. 2:6 when he says: “And now you know what withholds, that he may be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity already works, only that he who now holds should hold until he be taken out of the way. And then that wicked one will be revealed, etc.” There, Paul does not dare to write openly on the toppling of the Roman Empire, because he still explained openly in the presence of Romans and he spoke as if to say: You know what should impede the arrival of Antichrist. I said to you, the Roman Empire impedes it, because its sins have not been filled and Antichrist, who shall abolish this empire on account of its sins, will not yet have come. Therefore, the one who now holds the Roman Empire should hold it, that is, he will rule, until it comes to pass from our midst, that is, it shall be abolished; then the wicked one will be revealed. The Greek and Latin Fathers explain it alike. Cyril of Jerusalem teaches on this passage: “The aforesaid Antichrist will come when the times of the Roman Empire have been completed.” [71](#) St. John Chrysostom explains: “When the Roman Empire has been abolished from our midst, then Antichrist will come.” Theophylactus and Oecumenius teach similar things.

From the Latins. Tertullian says that Christians prayed for the Roman Empire to long endure, because they know that when the Empire has been overturned, the supreme destruction of the world threatens. [72](#) Lactantius, explaining the signs which precede Antichrist and the end of the world, says: “The Roman name, which now rules the world (the soul shudders to say it, but I will speak on what is going to come), will be abolished from earth, and the Empire overturned in Asia, and again the East will rule and the West will serve it.” [73](#) St. Ambrose, speaking on 2 Thess., says that Antichrist is going to come after the disappearance of the Roman Empire.

St. Jerome, explaining the same citation of St. Paul, says: “Christ will not come unless first there will be such a dissension that all the nations which now are subject to the Roman Empire will recede from it and unless the Roman Empire will already have been made desolate and thus

Antichrist precede him.” [74](#) Next, St. Augustine explains on this citation: “Such a one who merely commands, let him command, until he shall be taken from the midst; that is, abolished, and then the wicked one will be revealed, whom no one questions means Antichrist.” [75](#)

But this sign was not fulfilled in those times in which the Transylvanian Anti-Trinitarians say Antichrist came, that is, around the year 200, because then the Roman Empire particularly flourished and would do so long after. Moreover, it is clear that this sign has never been fulfilled to this point because the succession still remains, and the name Roman Emperor—even by a wondrous providence of God seeing that the Empire failed in the west, which is one of the legs of the statue of Daniel—remained unharmed in the East, the other leg. But because the Empire of the East was to be destroyed by the Turks (and now we see this has come to pass), again God erected in the West the other leg, that is, the Western Empire through Charlemagne, and that emperor still endures.

Moreover, the fact that Rome itself, according to the prophecy of John, would fall in a certain measure, and lose the Empire, does not impede us. For the Roman Empire can stand well without the city of Rome, and the Roman Emperor can be so called when he lacks Rome, in the manner that he succeeds another Roman Emperor in the same dignity and power, whether he should have more or fewer provinces in his Empire. Otherwise Valens, Arcadius, Theodosius the younger, or their other successors even to Justinian, who all lacked Rome, could not be called Roman Emperors. Nor even would Charlemagne and his successors, who also did not possess the city of Rome, ever have been Emperors, which is false, and that is clear for two reasons.

First, by this reason alone the emperor, who now is, precedes all Christian kings, even if they are otherwise greater and more powerful than he is. Next, because it is certain that Charlemagne was created emperor with the agreement of the Romans, as Paul the Deacon witnesses; [76](#) and by the Greek emperor himself through legates sent to greet the emperor, as Ado witnesses, [77](#) as well as by the Persians and Arabs, that the emperor should be adorned with gifts, as Otho of Frisia relates. [78](#) Next, the Lutherans boast that they have three prince electors of the Roman Empire. Hence they cannot deny that the Roman Empire still endures.

Orosius rightly compares the Empire of Babylon with Rome, and he says that God by far more agreeably managed things with the Romans than with the Babylonians. For after 1,064 years from which Babylon was founded, in one day Babylon, the head of the Empire, was taken, and the emperor killed, and the empire was destroyed and desolate. But after so many years, 1,064 from which Rome began, Rome was taken by the Goths; but the Emperor Honorius, who then ruled, was unharmed, and the Roman Empire was preserved.

Hence the deception of our adversaries appears. They think the decay of the Roman Empire suffices for the coming of Antichrist; but Paul, John and Daniel, as well as the Fathers we mentioned above did not say that decay was necessary, but desolation. On the other hand, Luther, Illyricus and David Chytraeus object that this proof rather more makes their case, for it was preached by John in the Apocalypse, chapter 13, that the beast, which signifies the Roman Empire, was to be wounded to death, and was again healed by Antichrist. This certainly came about when the Pope restored again the Western Empire, which had already perished, in conferring upon Charlemagne the title and dignity of Emperor. Therefore, it is clearly understood from this translation or restoration of the Empire that the Roman Pope is truly the Antichrist. [79](#) Illyricus confirms this argument from Ambrose, who, while explaining the words of St. Paul, says that Antichrist is going to return freedom to the Romans, but under his own name. The Pope seems to have done this when he created an emperor for the Romans, who still depended upon him.

I respond: we read nowhere in John that when the beast is going to be healed by Antichrist that it signified the Roman Empire. But we read this, that one of the heads of the beast will die, and a little after is going to rise again, by the works of the dragon, that is the devil; which nearly all the Fathers explain concerns Antichrist himself, who makes himself dead, and again by some diabolic craft he himself raises himself, that he would imitate the true death and resurrection of Christ, and in that manner will seduce many.

St. Gregory so explains this, as do Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Anselm, Richardus and Rupertus on chapter 13 of the Apocalypse. And the text itself compels us that through the head of the beast, which was dead and brought back to life, we should not understand Charlemagne, but Antichrist. Accordingly, that head, as John writes, had power only for 42 months, and

blasphemed God and those who dwelled in heaven, and commanded in every tribe and people, tongue, nation, and all who dwelled on earth adored it but of such things we do not read on Charlemagne or any of his successors. Furthermore, Charlemagne ruled for more than 42 months and he did not blaspheme God and the saints, but rather more wonderfully venerated them, and many of his successors imitated his piety.

Next, neither Charlemagne himself, nor his successors, held power over every tribe, people, tongue and nation, as is known by all. Hence St. Ambrose did not speak on what the Pope did when he said a new Roman Empire that was to be created by Antichrist; rather after the Roman Empire had been overturned freedom was to be restored to the Romans, which it is not read the Pope ever did.

CHAPTER VI: A Third Proof: Enoch and Elijah

A THIRD proof is taken from the arrival of Enoch and Elijah, who are still living and do so for the purpose that they might oppose the arrival of Antichrist, preserve the elect in the faith of Christ and finally convert the Jews; it is certain that this still has not been fulfilled. There are four Scriptures on this matter. The first, from Malach. 4: “Behold, I will send the Prophet Elijah to you, before the great day of the Lord will come, and convert the hearts of the fathers toward the sons, and the hearts of the sons to their fathers.” The second, from Eccles. 68, where we read on Elijah: “You who were received in a fiery whirlwind, in the whirlwind of vast horses. You who are inscribed in the judgments of the times, appease the anger of the Lord, reconcile the heart of the father to the son, and restore the tribe of Jacob.” And in chapter 64: “Enoch pleased God, and was lifted up into paradise, that he should bring repentance to the nations.” Third, from Matthew 17: “Elijah is going to come, and will restore all things.” Fourth, from the Apocalypse 11: “I will give my two witnesses, and they will prophecy for 1,260 days.”

Even Theodore Bibliander relates all these citations in his *Chronicle*, but he says through Enoch and Elijah all the faithful ministers are understood, whom God rouses in the time of Antichrist; such were Luther, Zwingli and the others. At length, he concludes: “This is why it is a puerile imagination, or a Jewish dream, to await either Elijah or Enoch as definite persons in their properties.” Chytraeus teaches the same thing in his commentary on that citation of the Apocalypse. And they attempt to show that the Lord taught that those passages in Malachi which speak about Elijah must be understood on John the Baptist: “He is Elijah who is going to come.” And St. Jerome, in chapter 4 of Malachi, shows this to be about all the choir of prophets, that is on the doctrine of all the prophets.

Now, it does not seem to be a puerile imagination to us but a very true teaching, that Enoch and Elijah are going to come in their own persons—and the contrary is either heresy or an error proximate to heresy. Firstly, it is

proved from those four Scriptures, since it is obvious that the words of Malachi could not be understood concerning anything at all, such as on teachers, like Luther and Zwingli and similar things, for Malachi says that the Jews must be converted by Elijah, and that they must be sent especially on account of the Jews which we see in that verse: “I will send to you,” and in Sirach: “... to restore the tribe of Jacob.” Yet, Luther and Zwingli have converted none of the Jews.

Moreover, it is certain that these cannot be understood on John the Baptist to the letter, but only on Elijah. We know that Malachi speaks on the second coming of the Lord because it will be to judge. For he says: “Before the great and terrible day of the Lord should come.” The first coming is not called the great and terrible, but the acceptable time, and the day of salvation. For that reason it is added: “Lest by chance coming I shall strike the earth with a curse;” in other words, lest coming to judgment and discovering all the wicked, I shall condemn the whole world. Therefore, I shall send Elijah, that I should have others whom I shall save. But in the first coming the Lord did not come to judge, but to be judged; not to destroy, but to save.

I will respond a little later to the words of Matthew 11. Now I speak to Jerome; in his commentary on Malachi he also did not think that Malachi spoke about Elijah, but in his commentary on Matthew 11 and 17 he thought and taught the contrary. Next, this is the common interpretation of the faithful, as St. Augustine witnesses. [80](#)

Moreover, Sirach speaks on the very persons of Enoch and Elijah, not on others. It is proven because Sirach says about this Enoch, “He who was taken into paradise [is going to come] that he should give punishment to the nations.” Also this Elijah, who was taken up in a chariot of fiery horses was going to come to restore the tribes of Israel. Certainly, such verses do not fit, unless they are about these particular persons.

I cannot marvel enough at what comes to mind from bishop Jansenius on this passage. He wrote on it that although it was the opinion of the Fathers that Elijah himself was going to come, still he is not convinced from this passage, for it can be said that the author of Sirach wrote that according to the received opinion of his time, wherein it was believed from the words of Malachi that Elijah was truly going to come in his person before the Messiah; although this would not be fulfilled in his own person, but in the

one who was going to come in the spirit and power of Elijah. Yet, if that is so, as Jansenius says, it follows that Sirach erred, and wrote falsely. Rather, unless I am mistaken, Jansenius changed his opinion; writing on chapter 17 of Matthew he teaches that the passage of Malachi cannot be understood literally except concerning the true Elijah, which likewise would compel him to say the same on the verse in Sirach, which he expressed with no doubt on Malachi.

Now that the words of the Lord in Matthew 17 are understood on the true Elijah, not on John, is clear because John had already come and run his course, and still the Lord said: "Elijah is going to come." Moreover, it can be proved that all the Doctors only understand this to be on the true Elijah. Firstly, because the Apostles who advanced the question on Elijah were Peter, James and John, and they took up the occasion from the transfiguration of the Lord, where they saw Moses and Elijah. Therefore, when they ask: "What about what the scribes say, that Elijah must come first?" they spoke on that Elijah whom they saw on the mountain with Christ. Therefore, when Christ responded, "Indeed, Elijah is going to come and he will restore all things," he also spoke on that particular Elijah who had appeared in the transfiguration. Secondly, the same is clear from the words themselves: "And he will restore all things." Truly, John the Baptist did not do that, nor anyone else. For to restore all things is to recall all Jews, heretics and perhaps many Catholics deceived by Antichrist to the true faith.

But Bibliander insists that the Lord speaks of John the Baptist in Matthew 11: "He is Elijah who is going to come," that is, he [John] is the Elijah promised by Malachi. I respond: The Lord wanted to say that John was the promised Elijah, not literally, but allegorically. Therefore, he sent him ahead, although you wish to receive him, as if to say, indeed the Elijah promised in his person is going to come in the last coming. Still, if you also wish to receive some Elijah in the first coming, then receive John. For that reason he also added: "He who has ears to hear, let him hear," thereby showing it was a mystery that he had said John was Elijah.

Next, that the words of John in Apocalypse XI should be understood on the individual persons of Enoch and Elijah is clear not from all the doctors but for the very reason that John says in the same place that they will be killed by Antichrist and that their bodies will remain unburied on a street in

Jerusalem, and after three days they will rise again, and they will ascend into heaven. No one has yet done that.

Still, David Chytraeus tries to respond in a commentary on this citation. He says first: John wanted to signify the many Lutheran ministers that would be killed by Papists, to whom God at length restored to life although he brought them into heaven, they were going to live forever. Secondly, he adds a little below that after the ministers were killed, life of the body was to be restored on the last day of resurrection. Thirdly, he adds in the same place that it can even signify through this restoration of life, and that we shall see many other ministers with the same zeal and power raised by God.

Yet these are very weak responses. The first cannot be defended, because the beatitude of the soul is not the restoration of lost life, but the acquisition of new life. Next, these two witnesses in the Apocalypse will rise in the sight of all and with their bodies restored; turning they will be lifted up, which certainly is not fulfilled in the beatitude of the soul. The second answer avails to nothing since John says that those two witnesses were going to rise before the last day, while the state of this world still endures. But John adds that it is to strike great fear to their enemies by their resurrection, and a little afterwards the movement of the world is going to happen, and seven thousand men are going to perish. Next, the third answer is not to the point. For the Scripture says that those same who were dead are to be roused to life, and taken up into heaven. Moreover, we have not yet seen any Lutheran minister resurrect, or be assumed into heaven. Why, John says that Enoch and Elijah are going to preach wearing sackcloth, and the Lutherans so hate sackcloth that if by chance Enoch and Elijah wear it while they are Lutherans, they will immediately be cast out.

Secondly, it is proved from the consensus of the Fathers that Enoch and Elijah are truly going to come in their persons in the time of Antichrist. For Hilary, Jerome, Origen, Chrysostom and all other interpreters of Matthew 17 assert this about Elijah. In like manner do Lactantius, [81](#) Theodoret, [82](#) as well as Augustine [83](#) and Primasius. [84](#)

On Enoch together with Elijah, many who write on the Apocalypse assert that they are going to come to oppose Antichrist, such as Bede, Richard, and Arethas. Arethas also adds that it is believed without exception by the whole Church. Moreover, John Damascene, [85](#)

Hippolytus [86](#) the martyr, St. Gregory the Great [87](#) and Augustine [88](#) teach the same.

Thirdly it is proved because otherwise no reason can be given why these two should be taken up before death, and still live in mortal flesh who are going to die someday. Albeit the Jews say, as Rabi Salomon, [89](#) that Enoch was killed by God before his time, because he was light and inconstant, and they assert that Elijah, when he was born in the fiery chariot, was burned in his whole body by the flame. Perhaps the Lutherans who deny they are coming back think likewise; still all Catholics hold with certain faith that both live in their bodies. For the Apostle teaches that Enoch has not yet died; [90](#) Enoch was borne up lest he would see death, and that both he and Elijah were not yet dead but were going to die. Apart from those cited above, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine and Epiphanius clearly teach this.

Irenaeus, speaking about Enoch and Elijah, says: “The priests who are disciples of the apostles say that those, who were born up thence (into early Paradise) were borne up and there remain even to the end, tasting incorruption.” [91](#) Tertullian says about Enoch: “He has not yet tasted death, as glittering in eternity.” [92](#) Epiphanius says about Enoch and Elijah: “These two remain in body and soul on account of hope.” [93](#) Jerome in an epistle to Pammachius against John of Jerusalem says: “Enoch was borne up in the flesh; Elijah still was taken up in the flesh into heaven, and still has not yet died, being a tenant of Paradise, etc.” Augustine says: “We do not doubt that Enoch and Elijah live in the bodies in which they were born.” [94](#)

CHAPTER VII: The Fourth Proof: The Persecution of Antichrist

THE FOURTH proof is taken from the fact that it is certain the persecution of Antichrist will be the most severe ever known, to the extent that all public ceremonies and sacrifices of religion will cease.

We still do not see any of that. Now, the fact that the last persecution is going to be very severe is clear from what we read in Matthew 24: “Then there will be a great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world, nor will be.” Moreover, we read in Apocalypse 20: “Then Satan must be loosed,” who was bound even to that time.

St. Augustine, disputing on this citation, says in the time of Antichrist the Devil will be loosed, and hence that persecution will be much more severe than all the ones that preceded it; [95](#) the Devil can rage so much more cruelly loosed than bound. Therefore, he says, then the Devil is going to plague the Church with all his own and their strength. Further, Hippolytus the martyr and St. Cyril say that the martyrs whom Antichrist will kill are going to be more illustrious than all the previous ones, because the old martyrs fought against the human ministers of the devil, but these will fight against the Devil himself prowling personally. But certainly we have experienced nothing like that from the year 600 or even 1000.

The heretics say that they suffer a great persecution from Antichrist because some of their number are burned. But what comparison is there of that sort of persecution with that carried out by Nero, Domitian, Decius, Diocletian, and others? Accordingly, for one heretic who is burned, a thousand Christians formerly were burned—and that was exercised in the whole Roman world, not only in one place. Furthermore, at present when the supreme penalty is given a man is merely burned, but in ancient times they exercised the most diverse and unbelievable torments. [96](#)

Pope Damasus writes in the life of Marcellinus that over seventeen thousand Christians were killed by Diocletian, and Eusebius, who then lived, writes that all the prisons were so full with martyrs that no place was

left for criminals. [97](#) Moreover, in the whole of the book we cited, so many crowns were conferred for martyrdom in two hundred years that it would be impossible to undertake their number. Besides, the fact is that the heretics killed many more Catholics in the last ten or fifteen years in France and Flanders than inquisitors burned heretics in perhaps the last hundred. Therefore, they cannot call this persecution, but rather more civil war. For as Augustine teaches, when the true persecution of Antichrist will come, tribulation will only be upon the sons of the Church, but not upon their persecutors just as in the time of Diocletian and the princes of this world, Christians alone were slaughtered, but they did not slaughter.

For all that, were this to be called a persecution, then Catholics have a better claim to have suffered it than the Lutherans and Calvinists. For Catholics are the ones who were cast out from many areas and lost their churches, patrimony and even their country, without a doubt, to invaders seizing their things for the Ministers of this new Gospel; and as we said from the commentary of Laurence Surius and other historians of this time, it can be recognized that the fury of the Calvinists has taken up many more Catholics in a few years than heretics by the judgment of Catholic princes were given punishment for the denial of faith.

Nevertheless, Augustine proves the fact that the persecution is going to be well-known and manifest, while commenting on those words of Apocalypse 20: "And they surrounded the camp of the saints, and the beloved city." [98](#) By these words, it is meant that all the wicked were going to be together in the army of Antichrist, and were going to assault every church of the saints in open battle. For now there are many false men in the Church, who, concealing their malice, are outside the Church in heart but within the body. St. Augustine says: "But then they will all break out in open persecution from their hiding places of hate." Certainly, this has not yet been fulfilled in our time even though there never was a greater number of false brethren and feigned Christians. That this persecution is neither known nor manifested, neither they who say they suffer nor we who are alleged to cause it can say when this will begin.

Without a doubt the persecutions of Nero, Domitian and of other Roman Emperors were recorded diligently by Eusebius, Orosius, and Sulpitius. Nobody questions when these persecutions began and when they ended, just as no one questions when Christ came, because it was true and manifest and

we absolutely know when it was and by whom it was made manifest. Nor are there any opinions on our side on the matter. But the heretics who say that Antichrist has come and now for so many years has exercised persecution still cannot advance one author who recorded when Antichrist came or to whom he appeared first, or when he began the persecution. They even disagree among themselves, so much so that one might say he came in the year 200, another in the year 666, while another in 1273. Another yet will say the year 1000, while another 1200, so they do not speak as men who are awake, but seem like men who dream in quiet.

Next, the fact that in the time of Antichrist, on account of the atrocity of persecution, the public office and daily sacrifice of the Church will cease, which Daniel clearly teaches: "From the time when the continual sacrifice will have been taken away for 1290 days." In that place, by the consensus of every writer, he speaks on the time of Antichrist. Furthermore, Irenaeus, Jerome, Theodoret, Hippolytus the martyr and Primasius all express the same thing, that Antichrist is going to forbid all divine worship which is now exercised in the churches of Christians, especially the most holy sacrifice of the Eucharist. That this sign has not yet been fulfilled is evident from experience.

From that we can gather three things. 1) Antichrist has not yet come, since the continual sacrifice is still in force. 2) The Roman Pontiff is not the antichrist, rather, he is quite contrary to him, since the Pope carefully honors and guards the sacrifice which Antichrist is going to take away. 3) The heretics of this time, apart from all other things, are precursors of Antichrist since no one more ardently desires to altogether abolish the sacrifice of the Eucharist than they.

CHAPTER VIII: The Fifth Proof: The Duration of Antichrist

THE FIFTH proof is taken from the duration of Antichrist. Antichrist will not reign more than three and a half years, yet now the Pope has reigned spiritually over the Church for more than 1500 years. Further, not one of them can be assigned that will have reigned precisely three and a half years so as to be accounted for Antichrist. Therefore, not only is the Pope not the Antichrist, but the latter has not yet come.

Now, that the reign of Antichrist is going to be for three and a half years is gathered from Daniel [99](#) and from the Apocalypse. [100](#) There we read that the reign of Antichrist is going to endure through time, times and half a time. For time is understood as one year, through times two years, through half a time, half a year. John argues this same thing, for in Apocalypse 11 and 13, he says Antichrist is going to reign for 42 months, which correctly corresponds to three and a half years. The Hebrews use years and lunar months, even if they reconcile them to the solar by adding one lunar cycle to the sixth year. Moreover, three and a half lunar years correctly makes 42 months, or 1260 days; correspondingly the lunar year is full and complete in 12 months, of which each has 30 days, as Augustine teaches. [101](#)

What Daniel 12 says, namely that Antichrist is going to reign for 1290 days is not opposed to us, even though it is 30 more days than John had said. This is because John speaks on Enoch and Elijah, who will be slain by Antichrist a month before Antichrist shall perish.

Our adversaries respond to this in three ways. First, Chytraeus [102](#) says that times (*tempora*) cannot be taken for three and a half years because it is opposed to experience; and Paul says Antichrist is going to endure even to the coming of Christ. [103](#)

Secondly, he says a certain time can be placed for an uncertain one; hence, more than a thousand years ought to be understood for 42 months or 1260 days. Bullinger says the same thing, [104](#) and his reason seems to be

the one which Luther insinuates in his supposition of the times; because without a doubt it is certain from Apocalypse 20 that the Devil will be loosed for a thousand years. Thus, the coming of Antichrist with the temporal sword was in the thousandth year from Christ and he has already reigned more than 500 years; therefore, it is fitting to receive those 42 months as an uncertain time.

Thirdly, the Centuriators respond that Daniel and John take a day for a year, and hence for 1260 days, 1260 years should be understood. [105](#) The reason can be that in Daniel 9, 70 weeks are understood to be 700 years, not days. And Ezechiel 4 says: "I gave you a day for a year." And Luke 13: "Today it is fitting for me to walk, and tomorrow as well as every day;" that is, to live for three years. Chytraeus puts this reasoning in chapter 11 of the Apocalypse, where he says the years and months of the same are called angelic years and months, not human.

Now, the common opinion of the Fathers is to the contrary. Let us look at those who assert that Antichrist will only reign for three and a half years due to the passages we have noted. Hippolytus the martyr, in his *Oration on the Consummation of the World*, says: "Antichrist will reign over the earth for three and a half years, afterward his kingdom and glory will be snatched away from him." Irenaeus said: "He will reign for three years and six months, then the Lord will come from heaven." [106](#) Jerome adds: "The time means a year; the times, according to the propriety of the Hebrew terminology, which has dual numbers, prefigures two years; half of the time, six months, in which the saints must be entrusted to the power of Antichrist." [107](#) St. Cyril said: "Antichrist will reign for merely three and a half years which we say not from some Apocryphal book, but from Daniel the Prophet." [108](#) Likewise St. Augustine said: "Even a man who is half asleep and reads these things can hardly doubt that reign of Antichrist against the Church will be very savage, although it is to last a scanty space of time. For time and times, and half a season is one year and two, and half which makes three years and a half; and through this, the number of days that were placed in the Scripture makes clear the number of months." [109](#) Theodoret says like things on chapter 8 of Daniel, as do Primasius, Bede, Anselm, Haymo, Arethas, Richard and Rupert on the Apocalypse.

Secondly, the same is proven from the fact that the Scriptures say that the time in which the Devil is unleashed, as well as of Antichrist, will be very brief. “Woe to the earth and sea, because the devil descends to you having great wrath, knowing that he has but a short time.” [110](#) And again: “He bound him for a thousand years, and after these he ought to be freed for a short time.” [111](#) How I ask, will this be true, if Antichrist will reign for 1270 years? For he will be free longer than he was bound.

Thirdly, because, as Augustine [112](#) and Gregory the Great [113](#) argue, unless that fearsome persecution were brief, many would perish who are not going to perish. This is why the Lord also says: “Unless those days would be brief, all flesh would not be saved.” [114](#)

Fourthly, Christ preached for only three and a half years. Therefore, it would be fitting that Antichrist is not permitted to preach longer.

Fifth, the sum of those 1260 years, which our adversaries constitute, can in no way be accommodated to those words of Daniel and of John: “Time, times and half a time.” For through time it ought to be understood without a doubt one certain number like one day, one week, one month, one year, one purification, [115](#) one jubilee, [116](#) one century, one millennium. But if we receive one millennium, then Antichrist will reign for 3500 years, which our adversaries do not admit. If we receive one century, then the time of Antichrist will be 350 years, which they also do not admit, and the same is clear concerning one jubilee, etc.

Sixth, when we read Daniel 4, we read that the number of times that will pass are seven in which Nebuchadnezzar will be going to be outside his kingdom, but for those times all understand seven years. If we would understand years of years, as our adversaries would have it in their treatment of Antichrist, it would behoove them to say that Nebuchadnezzar lived outside his kingdom for 2,555 years.

It is not difficult to answer their petty syllogisms. For when Chytraeus said that what Daniel and John spoke of cannot be received as three and a half years, nor properly for our usage of years, because experience witnesses that Antichrist has already been prowling for a longer time, he manifestly begs the question, as the logicians say. For he assumes what is in question. That very thing is asked, whether Antichrist has come. But when he adds that by the opinion of St. Paul, Antichrist was going to rule even to

the second coming of Christ, and concludes that he must reign longer than three and a half years, he does not see that he either again begs the question or says nothing. For no order can be made, unless it is assumed that Antichrist has already come—but that is what the very question is about.

But to that which both he and Henry Bullinger say, that a certain number is taken up for an uncertain period in this passage, I respond: a certain number is only placed for an uncertain one when some full and perfect number is placed, such as ten, a hundred, or a thousand, but not when different numbers are assigned where great and small are mixed. Then, a certain number must be taken up for an uncertain one, just as when the Scripture says in Apocalypse 20 that the devil was bound for a thousand years, as Sts. Augustine and Gregory say, [117](#) but not when it assigns time, times and half time, or 1260 days, or 42 months. For to what end are there a variety of numbers, if an uncertain time is meant?

Now I will address the argument of Illyricus. In the Scripture one does discover what can rightly be called weeks of years. Still, not days for years, or months for years. For weeks of years we read in Leviticus 25: “You will count for yourself seven weeks of years, etc.” And certainly it is right to say that week is counted by the number seven in Greek, Latin and Hebrew. In Hebrew they say *sha-bo-ach*, (seventh) from *sha-bach*, which is seven, as is also said in Greek by *ethdomas*, and in Latin by *septimana*, through a number containing seven; just as seven days are called a week of days, so seven years are a week of years. But month of years, or day for year we never read, nor would it be correct to say it, because a month is not counted by some number, but by the cycle of the moon, which finished in thirty days. Hence the Hebrews call month *ya-rech*, that is moon, or *ko-desh*; that is the beginning of the moon, and in Greek month is *mēn*, because moon is called *mēnē*.

In like manner, day does not mean a number, but a time of light, as in Genesis: “God called the light day, and the darkness night.” Nor is the passage of Ezechiel opposed to this: “I give to you a day for a year.” [118](#) There, he did not wish to say years are literally meant by days, otherwise it would behoove Ezechiel to have slept on his left side for 390 years, which is impossible. For God had commanded that he should sleep upon his left for 390 days and added: “I give to you a day for a year.” So if those days were received for years, Ezechiel ought to sleep on his side for 390 years.

Yet he did not live that long. Therefore, it must be said that in that passage a day is truly received for days, but can mean years through a type, because those 390 days in which Ezechiel slept were a sign of the sleep of God, through which he tolerated the sins of the Israelites for 390 years.

Now, to the objection made by Chytraeus from Luke 13: “It is fitting for me to walk today and tomorrow, as well as the day after,” I respond: When Christ said this, he did not mean by these words that he was still going to preach for three years since the Lord said this in the last year of his life. For as Jerome notes, [119](#) the matter speaks for itself. Matthew, Mark and Luke did not write the deeds and words of the first two years of Christ’s public ministry, rather only the third year. Therefore, the Lord either understood by those three days the triduum which was about to be taken up on the journey to Jerusalem (as St. Albert and Cajetan explain), or he certainly wished to show by that manner of speaking that he was going to remain and preach still a little while, as Jansenius rightly teaches. Lastly, where in the world did Illyricus and Chytraeus find days and angelic months? None are found in Scripture.

CHAPTER IX: The Sixth Proof: The End of the World

THE SIXTH proof is taken from the last sign following Antichrist, that the end of the world will come about. For the arrival of Antichrist will be a little before the end of the world. Therefore, if Antichrist would have come a long time ago, as our adversaries say, the world should have ended a long time ago. Daniel spoke twice about Antichrist, [120](#) once explaining the vision, adding each in turn; the second, that after Antichrist the last judgment immediately follows. “I considered the horns and behold, a little horn arose, and three from the first horns were torn from his face. I watched until thrones were placed, and the Ancient of Days sat, etc.” And later, explaining the vision: “The fourth beast will be the fourth kingdom; the ten horns mean there will be ten kings and another kingdom will rise after them, and it will be more powerful than the first, and it will lay low the three kings ... And they will be betrayed into his hand through time, times and half a time, and he will sit in judgment, etc.”

The prophecy of John is similar: “After these it will be fitting for him to be freed for a short time, and I have seen the seats, and they sat upon them and gave judgment upon them, etc.” [121](#) Daniel said the same thing again afterward, in chapter 12. The reign of Antichrist will endure for 1,290 days, and he adds: “Blessed is he who waits and attains even to 1,335 days,” this is, even to sixty days after the death of Antichrist, because then the Lord will come to judge and he will render the crowns of justice upon the victors, just as Jerome and Theodoret show in their commentary on this citation.

Next, the same is gathered from Matthew 24: “This Gospel of the kingdom will be preached to all nations throughout the whole world, and then will come the consummation;” that is, the end of the world will be a little after. Then: “But immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; and then will appear the sign of the Son of Man, etc.” St. Paul says the same thing: “Then that wicked man will be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the

breath of his mouth, and by the glory of his coming he will bring him to ruin, etc.” [122](#) The Apostle teaches that almost immediately after Antichrist, Christ is going to come because he will intervene in that very short time, so that the frauds and deceits of Antichrist, which will have begun to be destroyed by Elijah and Enoch, will be utterly destroyed by the very arrival of Christ as well as the horrible preceding signs.

Moreover, the same is seen in 1 John 2: “Little children, now is the last hour; and just as you heard that Antichrist has come, now there are many Antichrists, whence you know it is the last hour.” In other words, John says that this time from Christ even to the end of the world is the last hour, that is, the last time or the last age, as St. Augustine says. And he proves this most beautifully from this principle that we know Antichrist is going to come at the end of the world. But now we have already spoken of his many forerunners, or lesser Antichrists. The sign is certain; this is the last hour, or age. It is in the same way that one could so argue about the last hour of night for we know the sun is going to rise at the end of the night. Furthermore, we see now many of its rays already illumine the sky so we know this is the last hour of the night.

Next, this is also the common consensus of the Fathers: Irenaeus, [123](#) Tertullian, [124](#) Augustine [125](#) and many others; we even see it in the testimony of our adversaries. They affirm that Antichrist is going to reign even to the end of the world, hence a little after his ruin it is going to be the end of the world. So from this sign, joined with that above, we make an unanswerable proof whereby it is proven both that Antichrist has not yet come and he is not the Roman Pontiff. For if the world is going to end immediately after the death of Antichrist and Antichrist will not be alive three and a half years after he appears, then it is clear that he will not appear or begin to reign except for three and a half years before the end of the world. But the Pope now, according to our adversaries, has reigned with both swords for more than five hundred years but still the world still endures.

CHAPTER X: On the Name of Antichrist.

NOW the fourth disputation follows, which will be on the proper name and character of Antichrist. Everyone agrees that these words of John in the Apocalypse pertain entirely to Antichrist: “He will make all, small with the great, rich and poor, free and slave to have his mark on their right hand, or on their foreheads, so that no one will be able to buy or sell unless he shall have this mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name: ‘this is wisdom’. He who has the knowledge will reckon the number of the beast. His number is of man, and that number is 666.” [126](#)

Now, there are a great many opinions on this number. The first is of those who say that this number does not designate a name, but the time of the arrival or the death of Antichrist. Bullinger would have it thus in the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse, that this is the time of the arrival of Antichrist. Similarly, the Centuriators say it designates the time of the death of Antichrist. [127](#) Still, some like Clithoveus claim that in the writings of St. John Damascene, [128](#) it means the death of Muhammad, whom he calls the Antichrist. Lyranus, on this citation, agrees with those who do not quite think Muhammad is the Antichrist, but still believe this number means the death of Muhammad was going to be in the year 666 A.D.

This opinion is most absurd. Firstly, because John says that he speaks concerning the number of the name of the beast. Secondly, because the beast, whose number this is, will command all businessmen, so that they will use that number in contracts, as is obvious from Apocalypse 13. Therefore, the number does not pertain to the death of the beast, but rather to the period when he is living. The third is also false, that Muhammad died in the year 666. Some say he died in the year 637, such as Matthew Palmerius; others in the year 630 like Cedrenus in his compendium of histories; while others still in the year 638, as John Vaseus in his *Chronicle of Spain*.

The second opinion is of David Chytraeus, who teaches on this place in the Apocalypse that the name of Antichrist is *lateinos*, or in Hebrew *Rom-yi-yet*, which is Roman. Hence the Pope, who is a Latin prince, since he rules in Latium, and is the Roman Pontiff, must be Antichrist. Theodore Bibliander teaches the same thing, [129](#) and for that reason the eleventh table of his *Chronology*, which he begins from the year 600, he titles “the Latin Popes”. There are two reasons: 1) what Irenaeus teaches in book 5 which has the appearance of truth, that this is going to be the name of Antichrist; 2) that really the letters of this name add up to that number, as follows:

200 ρ	λ 30	τ 300
6 ι	α 1	ε 5
40 η	τ 300	ι 10
10 ι	ε 5	τ 50
10 ι	ι 10	α 1
400 η	ν 50	ν 50
666	ο 70	666
	ς 200	
	666	

This opinion is completely careless. In the first place, Irenaeus indeed says that the name *lateinos* can probably be accommodated to Antichrist; but he adds it is much more probable that the name of Antichrist is not *lateinos*, but *teitan*, which also expresses that number, and the name is much more clear since it means the light of the sun.

Besides, the conjecture of Irenaeus, which was something at that time, is nothing now. For he says it is probable that Antichrist will be called Latinum, not because he ruled in Latium, but because the Latins then ruled so extensively and held almost the whole world. Since Antichrist ought to be a very powerful king, without a doubt he will seize the most powerful kingdoms that he will discover. Moreover, Irenaeus says that the kingdom of the Latins is the most powerful, since they really ruled then. Certainly that conjecture avails to nothing in our times, for the Latins no longer rule throughout the world; instead the Turks really rule, and among us the Spanish and the French, not the Latins.

Besides the name *Latin*, that it would mean Rome, is not written with an ει(but through the simple Iota (ι), so it does not render that number. In the same way the comment on the Hebrew word *Rom-i-yet* can be refuted. For

Roman can not end in a *tav*, since it would be a masculine noun. For that ending is feminine in Hebrew. Without that letter *tav*, the number 400 is missing for the name of Antichrist. Moreover, the noun *lateinos*, if it will be the name of Antichrist, will be proper to him especially in use, just as Arethas teaches, because it will need to be shown in a sign by all who buy or sell; yet the name *lateinos* is common. Still, no Pope has ever been called Latinus, either for their own name or for the name they take up; the Popes never call themselves Latins, only bishops or Pontiffs.

Next, Romanus was a proper name of only one Pontiff, though still he could not be Antichrist since he did not live more than 4 months. Secondly, such a name is common.

Next, if only this name *lateinos* or Romanus would effect the number 666, our adversaries would have an argument. But innumerable names are discovered that render the same number. Hippolytus the Martyr, in his sermon on the consummation of the world, recorded another name which renders that number, *arnoumai*; that is “I refuse.” Arethas records seven: *lampetēs*, that is *renowned*; *teitan*, that is *the sun*; *honikētēs*, that is *victor*; *kakos ho dēgos*, that is *wicked general*; *alēthēs blaberos*, that is *truly wounding*; *palai baskanos*, that is *once hating*; *amnos adikos*, which is a Gothic name, and in Latin comes out to DCLXVI, which makes 666 if we receive a D in Latin for 500, C for one hundred, L for fifty, X for ten, V for five, and I for one.

From more recent writers William Lindanus remarks that the name “Martin Luther” would render the number 666 if Latin letters were to be received for numbers after the customary usage of Greek and Hebrew in this way: A, 1; D, 2; C 3; D, 4; E 5, F, 6; G, 7; H 8; I, 9; K, 10; L, 20; M, 30; N, 40; O, 50; P, 60; Q, 70; R, 80; S, 90; T, 100; V, 200; X, 300; Y, 400; Z, 500. Gilbert Genebrardus remarks in the last book of his *Chronology* that even the name of Luther in Hebrew makes this number (*Luliter*).

I add two other things for the sake of Luther and Chytraeus, namely that David Chytraeus in Hebrew, and *saxoneios* (the Saxon) render 666, and the latter agrees with Luther just as the name Latin does to the Pope.

ך	4	σ	200
ב	2	α	1
י	10	ξ	60
ל	4	ο	70

כ	20	v	50
י	10	ε	5
ת	400	י	10
ך	200	o	70
י	10	ς	200
י	6		
	666		666

The third opinion is of many Catholics who suspect Antichrist will be called *antemos*, both because this name properly agrees with him and also that it renders the number exactly, as Primasius, Anselm and Richardus argue.

This opinion is correctly refuted by Rupert, since the name which John insinuates will not be the name imposed on Antichrist by his opponents, but the name which he will take unto himself and boast in, so much so that he will command it be written on the foreheads of men. Moreover, it is not believable that he is going to take a name so odious and vile, such as *antemos*, and being mindful of all others noted above.

The fourth opinion is of the same Rupert, who believes this number does not mean the name of Antichrist but means the threefold prevarication carried out by the devil in Antichrist. For a series of 6 numbers, because it does not reach as far as the sevens, in which there is rest and beatitude, is the number of the creature perishing through prevarication from rest. But the devil incurs a threefold prevarication, or rather more, he makes one threefold. First he transgressed when he sinned in himself; next, when he made the first man sin he added 60 to a simple six; then thirdly he will transgress when he will seduce the whole world through Antichrist, and then will have added 600 to 60.

The fifth opinion is of Bede, who proceeds on a contrary path, and teaches the number six is perfect, because God created the heaven and the earth in six days. Sixty, then, is more perfect and six hundred the most perfect, from which he gathers that Antichrist is meant by the number 666 because he will usurp for himself the most perfect tribute which should be given to God alone. We read a figure of it in the Book of Kings, where a weight of gold, which is offered to Solomon each year, was six hundred and sixty six thousand talents. [130](#) These two opinions do not appear to sufficiently square with what John says, since that number is the number of

a name, not a dignity or a prevarication. Yet these Fathers would hold their opinions on this passage with as much suspicion and conjecture.

Therefore, the truest opinion of this matter is of those who confess their ignorance and say that they still do not know the name of Antichrist. Such an opinion is of Irenaeus, [131](#) Aertbas and others on this place of the Apocalypse. If I may, I will ascribe the words of Irenaeus, because Chytraeus exhorts his readers to do the same, saying:

“Being zealous I exhort you that you view the last pages of Irenaeus on this place of the Apocalypse, 333 and 334, which profitably and piously dispute on this number, and among the rest he judges that Latin or Roman is the name of Antichrist, that is *lateinos*, etc. Now Irenaeus says the following: ‘It is more certain and less hazardous to await the fulfillment of the prophecy than to be making surmises and casting about for any names that may present themselves, inasmuch as many names can be found possessing the number mentioned and the same question will, after all, remain unsolved. For if there are many names found possessing this number, it will be asked which among them shall the man bear when he comes. It is not through a want of names containing the number of that name that I say this, but on account of the fear of God, and zeal for the truth. For the name *euanthas* contains the required number, but I make no claim regarding it. Then also *Lateinos* has the number six hundred and sixty-six; and it is very probable, this being the name of the last kingdom [seen by Daniel]. For the Latins are they who at present bear rule. I will not, however, make any boast over this. *Teitan* too, the first two syllables being the Greek vowels ε and ι, among all names which are found among us, is rather worthy of belief.... Inasmuch, then, as this name *Titan* has such arguments to recommend it, that from among the many names we could gather lest perhaps he who is to come will be called *Titan*, it has the greatest appearance of truth. We will not, however, risk the matter nor pronounce in earnest that Antichrist is going to have this name, knowing that if it were necessary for his name to be publicly revealed at the present, the one who beheld the vision of the Apocalypse would have made it known.’”

So, let Chytraeus hear the profitable, pious and erudite difference of Irenaeus, and not falsely impute to him what he never said. For Irenaeus judged that Antichrist might be Latin, or Roman, but he says that as often as it was repeated, the name of Antichrist could not be known in this time, and

he proved this opinion with two arguments. First, because many names are discovered which make that number, nor is it permitted to divine the name from so many like it, because it happens that it will be one which has been predicted. Next, because if God wanted it known in this time, he would have brought this out through John himself. But he adds, that it is not due to any poverty of names, but from fear of God and zeal for truth. And for that reason he brings forth three names, *euanthas*; *lateinos* , and *taitan*, whereby the second has a greater appearance of truth than the first, and he affirms the third to have more than the second, while he avows none of them for certain.

We could add a third reason from the same passage of Irenaeus. A little before we disputed against those who were gathering false names of Antichrist for their own purpose. For this reason, he says they fall into many troubles. For they express themselves with the danger of erring and deceiving others, and also of effecting that both they and many others will quite easily be seduced by Antichrist. When he will come, he will have some name which they will persuade him to have; he will not be held by them as Antichrist, and so he will not shun it. All such dangers without a doubt come upon the Lutherans, and especially this last one, because they have persuaded themselves that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist. When the true Antichrist arrives they will not easily recognize it and hence, will not avoid him.

Here we must remark that when he will have come, the name of Antichrist will be well known. Before Christ came, the Jews did not know for certain by what name he would be called, although the prophets preached much concerning his name. Even one of the Sibyls, in the first book of the songs of Sibyls, remarked that the number of the name of Christ was going to be 888, even as John writes that Antichrist's number is 666. But after Christ came, all controversy was abolished, and everyone knows he is called Jesus.

"But," says the Sibyll, "I will	I 10
teach you what his number may be.	η 8
For eight monads there are as	σ 200
many tens over it.	ο 70
And also 8 groups of ten, will	υ 400
mean faithless humans' name,	ς 200
remember."	888

It happens, that it is common to all prophecies of the prophets to be ambiguous and obscure until they are fulfilled, just as Irenaeus rightly teaches and proves. [132](#)

From these we take up the unanswerable argument to prove the Roman Pontiff is not the Antichrist and that Antichrist himself has not yet come. If Antichrist would have come and was the Roman Pontiff, his name would established for certain, as predicted by John, just as Christ for us —now there is no question—not even amongst the Turks, Jews, and Pagans, to the extent that he is named. But on the name of Antichrist there is still a great controversy, we make it plain by so many opinions that have been recited and refuted. Thus, the prophecy of John has not yet been fulfilled. Hence, Antichrist has not yet come nor is he the Roman Pontiff. Add the confirmation from the *Confession* of Augustine Marloratus, who in a great explication gathered from various Lutherans and Calvinists on the New Testament, so writes on this citation: “There are nearly so many explications of this passage whereby it appears it is very obscure and enigmatic.” Yet if the prophecy is still very obscure and enigmatic, then it is not fulfilled; Antichrist has not come. Accordingly, all prophecies, when they are fulfilled are made evident. Therefore, why does Marloratus, lay down in his preface in the Apocalypse that it is so clear that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, that if you were silent, the very stones would cry out?

CHAPTER XI: On the Mark of Antichrist.

INDEED, there are also two or three opinions on the mark of Antichrist. Firstly, the heretics of this time teach that the mark of Antichrist is some sign of obedience and union with the Roman Pontiff, yet they do not explain in the same way what that sign will be. Henry Bullinger would have it that it is the anointing of Confirmation, in which all Christians are marked on their forehead as obedient to the Roman Pontiff. [133](#) Theodore Bibliander says the character of Antichrist is the profession of the Roman faith, because a true worshiper would not be considered a true Christian unless he professed that he adheres to the Roman Church. [134](#) Additionally, David Chytraeus adds the oath of fidelity, which many are compelled to furnish to the Roman Pontiff. In like manner the priestly anointing that they receive on their forehead and hand, saying: “He impresses, as the Papists call it, an indelible character.” Therefore, he sinks down to statues and consecrated bread, as well as to be present at funeral masses. Now, what Sebastian Meyer and others along with Augustine Marloratus teach on this citation of the Apocalypse are not much different. But these petty arguments are easy to refute, both because they do not agree with the words of the text itself and also because all these signs were in the Catholic Church before their opinion holds Antichrist appeared.

1) We have from the text that there is going to be one mark, not many. For Scripture always speaks on an individual number both for a mark and for the name and number of the name of Antichrist. Therefore, the mark will be one. Likewise the proper name of Antichrist and his number are one. Hence, when our adversaries multiply so many marks they show that they do not know what it is that John is speaking about.

2) That mark will be common to all men in the reign of Antichrist and such is plain from the words themselves. He will make all the small and the great, rich and poor, free and slave receive his mark. But the oath of obedience and the priestly anointing agree with a very few individuals.

3) Scripture shows that the mark is of a type that could be borne without distinction on the right hand or on the forehead. He says: "He will make all receive the mark on the right hand or on their forehead." Moreover, this agrees with none of the arguments which our adversaries advance because the anointing of chrism cannot be received in the right hand and the profession of the Roman Faith can not be received in the hand nor on the forehead; it is made by the mouth through profession and preserved in the heart by faith. The oath of fidelity is furnished by hand and mouth but in no way can it be borne on the forehead. Priestly anointing is received neither in the right hand properly, nor on the forehead, but above the crown and on the fingers of each hand. Then the last point, to be present at funeral masses and to kneel before statues and the Eucharist, are not obligations for the forehead or the hand, but rather of the whole body, and they are particularly felt in the knees.

4) The same Scripture says that in the reign of Antichrist, nobody will be allowed to buy or sell unless they show the mark, or the name, or the number of his name. But how many people buy and sell in the dominion of the Roman Pontiff who have not yet been anointed with chrism, nor furnished an oath of fidelity and are not priests? Are there not in Rome itself, where the Roman Pontiff has his seat, a great many Jews who publicly conduct business, buying and selling, yet none of them have these signs?

Let us come to the another account, whereby we prove all of these signs are older than Antichrist. Antichrist, in the opinion of our adversaries, did not come before the year 666. Yet Tertullian flourished around the year 200 and still called Chrism (Confirmation) to mind. He says: "The flesh is washed so that the soul will be cleansed, the flesh is anointed so that the soul consecrated." [135](#) Cyprian lived around the year 250, and he remembered the chrism: "It is necessary for anyone who has been baptized to be anointed, so that after he has received the chrism, that is, anointing, he may be able to be the anointed of God and have in himself the grace of Christ." [136](#) Augustine lived around the year 420, yet he says on John: "What is it that all believers know to be the sign of Christ, but the cross? What sign is it that is applied to the forehead of believers, or in the water, by which we are regenerated, or in the oil in which we are anointed with

chrism, or the sacrifice whereby we are nourished, but the cross? Without it, none of these can be done rightly.” [137](#)

For equal reason, *to adhere* to the Roman Church before the year 600 was a sign and mark of a truly Catholic man. Augustine writes about Cecilianus, who lived around the year 300: “He paid no attention to the multitude of his conspiring enemies since he saw himself through communicatory letters joined to the Roman Church, wherein the supremacy of the Apostolic See always flourishes, and with the rest of the world, whence the Gospel came into Africa.” [138](#) Ambrose, who lived around 390, said: “It was inquired of the bishop whether he thought with Catholic bishops, that is, whether he thought with the Roman Church.” [139](#)

Victor of Utica, who lived around the year 490, writes of an Arian priest that wished to persuade the king not to kill a certain Catholic man using these words: “If you destroy him with a sword, the Romans will preach that he is a martyr.” [140](#) In such a place, by the name of Romans he means African Catholics, for certainly the Arians would not speak on behalf of a Roman unless he meant the faith of the Roman Church, since they did not follow the Arian treachery.

The oath of obedience made to the Roman Pontiff is found in the time of St. Gregory, [141](#) and hence is before the year 606, since St. Gregory did not survive to that year.

On priestly anointing we have the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, who lived around 380. In his *Apologetic* to his father when he became bishop of Sasimi he said: “When the anointing and the Spirit came over me, again I fell weeping and sad.” There he calls to mind two anointings, one which he had received when created a priest, the other which he had to receive in the episcopal ordination. Speaking about Basil, who, after he was created a bishop refused a province, he said: “When he believed the Spirit and the business of the talents and the care of the flock was consigned to him, and he was anointed by the oil of priesthood and perfection, still he delayed to receive a prefecture from his own wisdom.”

Now on the sacrifice for the dead, it will be enough to cite the testimony of Augustine, who says that it was a doctrine of the heretic Aërius that it was not fitting to offer sacrifice for the dead. [142](#)

Concerning the adoration of images, one testimony of Jerome, who lived in the year 400, will suffice for us. He said, in the life of Paul: “He worshiped, prostrate before the cross, just as if he discerned the Lord hanging there.” Next, in the adoration of the Eucharist, St. Ambrose should be sufficient testimony. While explaining that verse: *adore scabellum pedum eius*, he said: “Therefore, through a footstool the earth is understood; for the earth, the flesh of Christ, which today also we adore in the mysteries and which the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus, as we said above.” [143](#) Augustine says nearly the same thing in the same words in his explication of Psalm 98 (99).

So, since all these things which our adversaries suggest are marks of Antichrist were in the use of the Catholic Church for many years before Antichrist would have been born in their reckoning, necessarily it must be that Antichrist either learned from the Church, and so to say this is to confuse Antichrist with Christ; or none of these pertain to the marks of Antichrist. Now follows what we contend. These suffice for that rash and absurd opinion of our adversaries, which they try to show with no witnesses and no proofs.

The second opinion is of some Catholics, who think the mark of Antichrist is a letter wherein the name of Antichrist will be written. So say Primasius, Bede and Rupert, who seem to have been deceived from something which they read: “Unless someone will have the mark of the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” But John does not say this, rather he said: “Unless one will have the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” The Greek text agrees: *ei mē ho echōn to karagma to onoma tou thēriou ē ton arithmon tou onomatos autou*. [144](#)

The third opinion is of the martyr Hippolytus, and of certain others. He thought that the mark of the beast was going to be that he would not use the sign of the cross, but rather would curse and abolish it. In this the Calvinists would be outstanding precursors of Antichrist. At any rate, I believe it is a positive character that will be devised by Antichrist, just as Christ had the sign of the cross made known to all. Yet no one will know what this character will be until Antichrist comes, just as we said on his name.

CHAPTER XII: On the Begetting of Antichrist.

ON the fifth, concerning the begetting of Antichrist, there are some things that are clearly erroneous asserted by some individuals, then some things that are probable, and others that have been investigated and are certain. Firstly, there were once many errors on Antichrist. The first error is that Antichrist was going to be born from a virgin by a work of the devil, exactly how Christ was born by a work of the Holy Spirit.

An author of a little work on the Antichrist relates this error, which is held under the name of Augustine in the end of volume IX (though it is probable that the work is of a rabbi, certainly it cannot be of Augustine). It is clearly erroneous, for to produce a man without the male seed is a work of God alone, who can supply all efficient causes, because he alone is of infinite power and contains every perfection of creatures in his essence. The devil, however, is a creature, certainly he can do wondrous works by applying active things to passive things in a short period; but he cannot supply the active power of a cause. For this reason St. Augustine says that to be born of a virgin was such a miracle in Christ, that greater things could not be expected from God. [145](#)

Still it would not be an error if someone would say that Antichrist was going to be born from the devil and a woman, the same way that certain people relate that men are born from liaisons with demons. Although the devil by himself cannot produce a man without the male seed, still he can exercise a carnal act with a man taking on the form of a woman, and take his seed; and then exercise a like act with a woman in the form of a man, and place the seed received from the man into the womb of the woman to beget a man in that manner. St. Augustine witnesses this, [146](#) and adds that experience has so proven it that it seemed to him that one would be impudent to deny it.

The second error was of the blessed martyr Hippolytus, who in his sermon on the end of the world, teaches that Antichrist is the devil himself, who will assume false flesh from a false virgin. For as the Word of God, which is truth itself, assumed true flesh from a true virgin, so Hippolytus thought it probable that the devil, who is the father of lies, was going to simulate that he had taken human flesh from a virgin. This opinion is refuted, both because in 2 Thessalonians 2 Antichrist is called a man, and also because the rest of the Fathers write in a common consensus that Antichrist is going to be a true man.

The third error is that Antichrist is going to be a true man, but at the same time also the devil, through the incarnation of the devil, just as Christ through the Incarnation is true God and man. Several Fathers relate and refute this error. [147](#)

Origen believed this opinion is possible, inasmuch as he asserted that some angels were truly incarnate, which Jerome refutes in his preface to Malachi as well as in the first chapter of Haggai. And without a doubt, it is erroneous since a person cannot be created and thus sustain two finite natures in the way that the Word of God, who is infinite, can. There is no controversy on this amongst theologians, although some may teach that it altogether implies contradiction others teach it does not imply one. Nevertheless, all agree on the point that creatures, such as the devil, cannot do that by their power alone.

The fourth error is that Nero is going to rise from the dead and he is going to be the Antichrist, or certainly that he will still live and be preserved secretly in the vigor of youthful age and appear as he did in his own time. Sulpitius suggests this error; [148](#) but St. Martin writes that Nero himself will not be Antichrist, rather he is going to come with Antichrist and at length, must be destroyed by Antichrist. [149](#) Yet, because all these are said without any proof from reason, St. Augustine rightly calls this opinion a remarkable presumption. [150](#)

Apart from these errors there are two probable opinions of the holy Fathers on the begetting of Antichrist.

1) That Antichrist is going to be born from a woman by fornication, not from a legitimate marriage. St. John Damascene teaches this, [151](#) as well

as certain others. Still, since it cannot be shown from the Scriptures it is not certain, although it is probable.

2) Antichrist will be born from the tribe of Dan, which many Fathers and Doctors assert. [152](#) They prove this from Genesis 49: “Let Dan be a snake on the path, let him be a horned snake on the path, etc.” Likewise in Jeremiah 8: “From Dan we heard the growling of his horses, etc.” Next, because in Apocalypse 7, where twelve thousand from every tribe of the sons of Israel is signified by the angel, the tribe of Dan is left out, which appears to be done in hatred of Antichrist.

This opinion is exceedingly probable on account of the authority of such Fathers; still it is not altogether certain, both because a great many of these Fathers do not say they know this but hint that it is probable, and because none of those passages of the Scripture clearly prove it. In the first place, in Genesis, Jacob seems literally to speak about Samson, when he says: “Let Dan be a serpent on the way, a horned snake on the path, and let him bite the hoofs of the horses so that the rider falls upon his back.” For Samson was from the tribe of Dan, and was truly a serpent in the road for the Philistines. For he resists and plagues them everywhere. Jerome shows this in *Hebrew Questions*. It appears well enough that Jacob prayed well for his son when he said this, and hence did not predict evil but good.

Nevertheless, if this were to be accommodated to Antichrist allegorically, such as is brought in from the spiritual senses of Scripture, the argument could not be said to be more than probable. Moreover, Jeremiah 8 without a doubt does not speak on Antichrist, nor on the tribe of Dan, but Nebuchadnezzar, who was going to come to destroy Jerusalem through the region which was called Dan. [153](#) But why Dan, whose tribe was one of the greatest, is omitted in Apocalypse 7 is not sufficiently established.

Apart from these two probable opinions, there are two certain ones.

1) Antichrist will come particularly on account of the Jews, and will be received by them as if he were a Messiah;

2) He is going to be born from the nation and race of the Jews, be circumcised, and shall observe the Sabbath, at least for a time.

The first opinion is certain from the following. It is in John's Gospel where the Lord says to the Jews: “I have come in my Father's name, and you have not received me. If another will have come in my name, you will receive him.” We proved that this citation ought to be understood to be

about Antichrist in the second chapter above. Then, from the Apostle: “For the reason, since they do not receive the charity of truth that they may be saved, God will send to them the operation of error, that they would believe lies, etc.” [154](#) Calvin and other heretics in commentaries on these words argue that these words are about us [Catholics], who, because we do not receive their Gospel, he permitted to be seduced by Antichrist. But we have all the interpreters on our side, who show it speaks about the Jews. See Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylactus, and Oecumenius.

Apart from them, Jerome says the following: “Antichrist will make all these things not with virtue, but from the concession of God on account of the Jews and because they refused to receive the charity of truth, the spirit of God through Christ, that having received the Savior they would be saved; God will send upon them not an operator, but the operation itself, that means the font of error, that they would believe lies, etc.” [155](#) Even without so many commentaries of the Fathers the matter speaks for itself; the Apostle speaks about the Jews. For he says Antichrist must be sent to them who refuse to receive Christ. Moreover, who else is there that can be said to ought to have received Christ, but refused, more than the Jews? It also must be remarked, the Apostle did not say because they will not receive the truth but because they have not received it. Therefore, he speaks on those who refused to believe the preaching of Christ and the Apostles. It is certain in the times of the Apostles, the Gentiles eagerly received the Gospel, but the Jews refused to.

So apart from Jerome and other citations, all the other Fathers teach the same thing. [156](#) Even reason argues for it. For Antichrist, without a doubt, will join himself to those who are prepared to receive him; the Jews are of this sort, who await the Messiah as a temporal king and Antichrist will be such a king. For the Gentiles await no one. Moreover, Christians indeed wait upon Antichrist, but with fear and terror, not with joy and desire. Therefore, just as Christ first came to the Jews to whom he had been promised and by whom he had been awaited, and at length also joined the nations to himself, so also Antichrist will first come to the Jews, by whom he is awaited, and thereupon little by little subjugate all the nations to himself.

Now to the second opinion, that Antichrist is going to be a Jew and circumcised; this is certain and is deduced from the aforesaid. For the Jews

have never received a non-Jewish man, or an uncircumcised one for a Messiah. Nay more, the Jews also await a Messiah from the family of David and the tribe of Judah; certainly Antichrist, although he could be from the tribe of Dan, will pretend that he is from the household of David. Next, all the Fathers very clearly teach that Antichrist will be a Jew, such as those twelve cited a little while ago, who say he is going to be from the tribe of Dan. Besides, Ambrose, on *2 Thess. 2*, asserts that he will be circumcised; Jerome teaches in his commentary on Daniel 11 that he is going to be born from the Jewish people; St. Martin teaches that Antichrist is going to command that all be circumcised according to the law, [157](#) and St. Cyril asserts that he will be exceedingly zealous for the temple of Jerusalem to show himself to be from the progeny of David. [158](#) At length, even Gregory says that Antichrist is going to keep the Sabbath and all the other ceremonies of the Jews. [159](#)

From these we have the most evident proof that the Pope is not the Antichrist. For from the year 606, in which our adversaries say Antichrist came, it is certain that no Pope was a Jew, whether by race or religion or any other manner. It is also certain that the Pope to this point was never received by the Jews as a Messiah, but on the other hand is held as an enemy and a persecutor. For this reason they ask God in their daily prayers that God would give to the living Pope a good mind toward the Jews and that he might send a Messiah in their days who would liberate them from the power of the Pontiff, and a bishop such as the Supreme Pontiff especially is, which they call *tey-na-mon* but in Syriac means tail, and is opposed to head. For while we call a bishop the head of the people, they on the other hand call him a tail as an insult; the head is absent so that they might be prepared to receive a high priest as a head for their Messiah.

Therefore, R. Levi Gerson, in chapter 7 and 11 of Daniel, explains all those things which are said about Antichrist concern the Roman Pontiff, whom he calls another Pharaoh and opposed to the coming Messiah. See the *orationes Mahasor*, fol. 26.

CHAPTER XIII: On the Seat of Antichrist

WE continue to the sixth. Our adversaries impudently affirm that the particular seat of Antichrist is Rome, or even founded upon the apostolic throne at Rome. For they say Antichrist is going to invade the See of Peter, and will carry off the summit to the highest place and thence tyrannically preside over and dominate the whole Church. They try to show that Rome is the royal city of Antichrist from Apocalypse 17, where John, speaking on the seat of Antichrist, says it will be a great city which will sit upon seven hills and which has rule over the kings of the earth.

Moreover, they try to show that Antichrist will have his seat at Rome, not in the palace of Nero but in the very Church of Christ, from what Paul says in 2 Thess. 2, that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of God. For when he says absolutely, “in the temple of God,” they understand the true temple of the true God. There is no such thing unless it is the Church of Christ, since the temples of the Gentiles are true temples, but of demons, not God. Moreover, the temple of the Jews was indeed for God but had already ceased to be a temple when the sacrifice and priesthood of the Jews ceased. For these three (the temple, the sacrifice and the priesthood) are so joined that you cannot have one without the other. Besides, that temple of the Jews was laid desolate and never in the future to be rebuilt, as Daniel says: “And even to the end of the world the desolation will continue;” [160](#) therefore, the Apostle does not speak about it.

The argument is confirmed from the Fathers. Jerome says: “In the temple of God he will sit, either in Jerusalem as some men think, or in the Church, as we reckon is more true.” [161](#) Oecumenius: “He did not say the temple of Jerusalem, but the Church of Christ.”

Theodore Bibliander adds the testimony of Gregory, who wrote in a letter to John of Constantinople: “The king of pride is near, and it is not unlawful to say that an army of priests is prepared for him.” From such

words he takes up a two-fold argument. One is thus; John of Constantinople is said to be a precursor of Antichrist, because he wished to be called universal bishop; so that will be Antichrist, who really will make himself a universal bishop, and will sit in the Church as the head of all. On the other hand, the army of Antichrist will be priests therefore, Antichrist will be a prince of priests. From this the heretics reckon that they have clearly shown that the Roman Pontiff is Antichrist seeing that he rules at Rome, he sits in the temple of God and he is called Universal bishop as well as Prince of Priests.

Just the same, the true opinion is that the seat of Antichrist will be Jerusalem, not Rome, and the temple of Solomon as well as the throne of David, not the temple of St. Peter or the Apostolic See. We can prove the fact by a two-fold argument: First, by refutation, then from the Scriptures and the Fathers.

First, I will establish the argument. Let us say that Antichrist will sit in the Church of Christ and he will be held as prince and head of the Church, and in that he will manage magistracy and offices, as Melanchthon, Calvin and other heretics teach. [162](#) Moreover, the Roman Pope is Antichrist, as these writers teach in the same places; therefore, the Roman Pope sits in the true Church of Christ, and is the prince and head of the Church. But there can only be one true Church of Christ, just as Christ is one, as even Calvin teaches; [163](#) therefore, the Lutherans, Calvinists and all others are foreign to the Church, which is under the Pope, that is outside of the true Church of Christ.

Calvin sees this argument and responds that the Church is not under the Pope as much as the ruins of the Church of Christ are seen there. He says as much in the *Institutes*: “Still, as in ancient times, there remained among the Jews certain special privileges of a Church, so in the present day we do not deny that the Papists have those vestiges of a Church which the Lord has allowed to remain among them amid the dissipation. ... He provided by his providence that there should be other remains also to prevent the Church from utterly perishing. Yet, when they pull down buildings the foundations and ruins are often permitted to remain; so he did not suffer Antichrist either to subvert his Church from its foundation, or to level it to the ground, but was pleased that amid the devastation the edifice should remain, though

half in ruins... Hence, we scarcely deny that churches remain under his tyranny.” [164](#)

But, his solution provides two arguments for us. 1) If only the ruins of the Church of Christ remain, therefore, the Church of Christ is ruined; hence Truth lied when it said: “And the gates of hell will not prevail against it.” [165](#) 2) The Church is ruined as well as its ruins and foundation, so that the Papists also hold semi-ruined buildings; therefore, the Lutherans and the Calvinists have no Church. For they do not have the whole Church of Christ, since it is now a ruin, and still the ruins remain; but they do not even have the edifice, for that is with the Papists under Antichrist. Therefore, what is it that they have? By chance a new building? But that which is new is not of Christ. But who, unless he were blind, does not see that he is safer in the true Church of Christ (even if an edifice), than to remain in nothing?

Now I come to the Scriptures whereby it is proved that the seat of the Antichrist is going to be in Jerusalem, not Rome. The first is in chapter XI of the Apocalypse, where John says that Enoch and Elijah are going to fight with Antichrist in Jerusalem, and must be killed there by the same Antichrist: “And they will throw their bodies in the streets of the great city, which is spiritually called Sodom, and Egypt, where even their Lord was crucified.” Arethas in this citation says: “Their bodies he will cast out unburied in the streets of Jerusalem, for in it he will reign as King of the Jews.” Likewise, all other interpreters show, and this can rightly be said to be Jerusalem, and it cannot be denied. For what City is it in which the Lord was crucified but Jerusalem?

This is why Chytraeus, who would rather this city were Rome, passes over the words “Where even their Lord was crucified,” as if they did not pertain to the matter, or as though he had not read them. Nor is it opposed to what Jerome says, when he tries to show that Jerusalem cannot be called Sodom, since everywhere in Scripture it is called the holy city. For in that epistle he persuades Marcellus that, after leaving Rome behind, he should come into Palestine and there he can heap up all those places in praise of Jerusalem and in censure of Rome, and try to excuse Jerusalem in every manner. Nor does he do it in his own name, but in the name of Paula and Eustochius, to whom he thought forgiveness must be given, if they were to explain something a little differently than the matter stood. That the earthly Jerusalem can be called Sodom on account of the lust and the crimes of the

Jews is also clear from Isaiah, who when he prefaced a title to the first chapter: "The Vision of Isaiah, which he saw over Judah and Jerusalem," he next added: "Hear the word of the Lord, O princes of Sodom! Perceive with your ears the law of God, O my people Gomorrah!"

Further, it is not a valid argument that Jerusalem is called holy, therefore, it cannot be called Sodom. For just as in the same epistle Jerome says that Rome is called Babylon by John, and the purple whore on account of the heathen emperors, and still, the same is holy on account of the Church of Christ, and the tombs of Peter and Paul; so also Jerusalem is the holy city, on account of the prophets and apostles who preached there, on account of the cross of Christ and his tomb and like things yet still it is Sodom and Egypt on account of the crimes of infidelity of the Jews and their blindness.

The Second place is Apocalypse 17, where John says there will be ten kings who divide the Roman Empire, and from such rulers Antichrist will come, having hatred for the purple whore, that is Rome, and are going to lay waste to her and even burn her with fire. How, therefore, will it be the seat of Antichrist, if he should overturn and burn it at that time?

Add that, as we showed above, Antichrist will be Jewish, and the Messiah of the Jews, and a king; therefore, without a doubt he will constitute his seat in Jerusalem, and he will hasten to restore the temple of Solomon. For the Jews dream of nothing other than Jerusalem and the temple, nor do they seem ever to be going to receive anyone for a Messiah who would not sit in Jerusalem and restore the temple in some way. Lactantius says for this reason, that in the time of Antichrist the supreme kingdom is going to be in Asia and the West will serve, the East will rule.

[166](#) He also determines the part of Asia in which this kingdom will be and says it will be Syria, that is, Judaea, which is part of Syria, and which is always called Syria by the Latins. [167](#) In like manner, Jerome and Theodoret, commenting on chapter 11 of Daniel, gather from Daniel himself that Antichrist is going to set up his tents in the region of Jerusalem, and at length it will end on mount Olivet. Further, Irenaeus clearly said that Antichrist was going to rule in Jerusalem. [168](#)

The third place is in the words of Paul: "So that he would sit in the temple of God." [169](#) Although different expositions are given by the Fathers, some also understand through the temple of God the minds of the

faithful, in which Antichrist is said to sit after he will have seduced them, as Anselm expresses. Some understand through the temple Antichrist himself, with his whole people; Antichrist would want himself and his own to seem the true spiritual temple of God, that is, the true Church, as Augustine explains. [170](#) There, he deduces this exposition from the manner of speaking which Paul uses, who did not say in Greek *en tō naō* (in the temple), but *eis ton naon* (into the temple), as if to say Antichrist will sit within the temple of God, that is, just as if he, with his own, were the temple of God. Although this annotation of Augustine is not necessary, for even if in Latin it is not correct when it says to sit within the temple, rather than in the temple, still in Greek it is not said incorrectly: *kathezoumai eis tēn ekklēsiān*, or *eis ton naon*, as it is commonly read.

Some also understand the churches of Christians, which Antichrist will command to serve him, as Chrysostom interprets it. Still the exposition is the more common, probable and literal of those who teach that for the temple of God is understood the temple of Solomon, in whichever renewed temple that Antichrist will sit in. Especially in the New Testament, the churches of Christians are never understood for Temple of God; rather that is always understood as the temple in Jerusalem. What is more, the Latin and Greek Fathers for so many centuries never called the churches of Christians temples, which in Greek are called *naos*, as St. Paul says in this passage; rather they call them *euchtēria*, that is oratories, as churches, or houses of prayer, or basilicas, or martyria.

Certainly neither Justin Martyr, nor Irenaeus, nor Tertullian, nor Cyprian use the noun “temple” when they treat on the Churches of Christians, and Jerome says that Julian the Apostate ordered that the basilicas of the saints either be destroyed or turned into temples. [171](#)

Further, the reason why the Apostles do not call the churches of Christians temples is two-fold. 1) Because then they did not have any temples, but only certain places in private houses that they set aside for prayer, a sermon and the holy celebration of the Mass. 2) Because while the memory of the Jewish temple still flourished, the Apostles were to introduce something similar to distinguish the church from the synagogue, so they avoided the use of the word “temple”, just as on account of the same reckoning the Apostles in Scripture never call Christian priests “priests” [*sacerdotes*], but only bishops and elders. But after Jerusalem was

destroyed and the temple burned, and the memory of the old temple and its priesthood abolished, everywhere the holy Doctors began to use the word “temple” and “priesthood”.

Therefore, since the Apostle, writing that Antichrist was going to sit in the temple of God, said something which he wished to be understood by those to whom he wrote, and then they did not understand in the word “temple” anything else but the temple of Jerusalem, which appears for certain to be what the Apostle spoke about. But it is also confirmed from the common exposition of the Fathers.

Irenaeus says: “When Antichrist will have sat in the temple of Jerusalem, then the Lord will come.” [172](#) Hippolytus the martyr (*loc. cit.*), says: “he will build a temple in Jerusalem.” St. Martin (*loc. cit.*) teaches the same thing. Cyril of Jerusalem says: “What kind of temple does the Apostle speak of? In the temple that is the relic of the Jews. God forbid that it should happen in this, in which we are.” [173](#) Hilary says on Matthew 25, “Antichrist, being received by the Jews, will stand in the place of sanctification.” It is certain that he is talking about the temple of the Jews, for he calls it the place of sanctification, which is what Christ calls it in Matthew 24 when he said: “When you will have seen the abomination standing in the holy place.” Ambrose says Antichrist, according to history, is going to sit in that temple in which the Romans threw in the head of a pig, in the time of the Emperor Titus; according to the mystical sense, he is going to sit in the interior temple of the Jews, that is, in their faithless minds. [174](#)

Sedulus explains, in this place of the Apostle, that in the temple of God, “He will try to restore the temple of Jerusalem, etc.” John Damascene says: “In the temple, not ours, but the old Jewish temple.” [175](#) Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylactus (who say Antichrist is going to sit in the churches of Christians), also say he is going to sit in the temple of Solomon. Chrysostom says on this verse: “He will command himself to be worshiped as a God, and to be placed in the temple, not only in Jerusalem, but even in the churches.” Theophylactus and Theodoret says the same thing; even Augustine and Jerome [176](#) do not deny Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of Solomon.

There is only Oecumenius, who denies that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of the Jews, but he is the more recent of all of them, and by no means do we put him before the other Fathers. By chance his text might have been corrupted and lacked only one sentence, for it is strange that he would suddenly recede from Chrysostom, Theodoret and Theophylactus whom he otherwise always follows.

Now we respond to the arguments of our adversaries given above. To the first I respond in three ways. 1) It can be said with Augustine, [177](#) Aretha, Haymon, Bede and Rupert on chapter 17 of the Apocalypse, that for the whore which sits upon seven hills and has a kingdom over the kings of the earth, that Rome is not understood, but the universal city of the devil, which in scripture is always called Babylon and is opposed to the city of God, that is, the Church, which is called Jerusalem. Through the seven hills is understood the universality of the proud, and especially of the kings of the earth.

Secondly, it can be said, and in my judgment better, that for the whore is understood Rome, as Tertullian [178](#) and Jerome [179](#) explain it; but Rome ruling the heathen, worshiping idols and persecuting Christians, not Christian Rome, for the same authors explain it in the same way.

One must truly marvel at the impudence of the heretics, who, as they try and show the Roman Church to be the purple whore, use the testimony of Tertullian and Jerome. For in that time when, heathen Rome was contrary to Christian Rome, which, I ask, do those Fathers call the purple whore? If heathen Rome, why therefore do the heretics abuse the testimony? If Christian Rome, therefore, already then the Roman Church had already sunk and then Antichrist already reigned, which not even they concede. Besides, if Christian Rome was then Babylon, why does Tertullian say: “O happy church, into which the Apostles poured the whole doctrine with their own blood.” [180](#) And why does Jerome, speaking about Rome, say: “I shall say to you, O great Rome you have blotted out the blasphemy written on your forehead by the confession of Christ”? Next, the same is clear from John himself, who speaks about that Rome, which held empire over the kings of the earth and that was drunk in the blood of the saints and from the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. That certainly did not take place except in that Rome which cut down the martyrs under the rule of Nero and Domitian.

3) I say, although that woman could be Christian Rome, as the heretics would have it, still their argument has no force. As we showed above, Antichrist will have hatred towards Rome, in no matter what way he takes it up, and he will fight with it and lay it desolate, and burn it. From which it manifestly follows that Rome is not the seat of the Antichrist.

Now to the second argument: we have already said Paul treats on the temple of Solomon in that passage. Hence to the reasoning which we made, I respond: After the Jewish sacrifice and priesthood ceased that temple ceased to be a Jewish temple; but it did not immediately cease to be the temple of God. The same temple could have been the temple of Christians and really was so long as it remained. For the Apostles preached and gave praise there after the ascension of Christ and the arrival of the Holy Spirit, as is clear from the words of Luke: "They were always in the temple praising and blessing the Lord." We read the same in Acts 3: "Peter and John went up into the temple for the prayer at the ninth hour." And in Acts 5, the angel says to the Apostles: "Speak in the temple all the words of this life to the people."

To the argument from Daniel I respond: either Daniel would have it that the temple is not going to be rebuilt, except at the end of the world (which is true since Antichrist will be present at the end of the world); or it is going to remain desolate in eternity because although it will be rebuilt, still it will never be a temple not profaned after the destruction carried out by Titus. When it will be raised up by Antichrist, then the abomination of desolation will especially remain in it, i.e. either Antichrist himself or his image, or the temple will never be perfectly rebuilt, but will still be in the beginnings of rebuilding, and Antichrist is going to sit in that temple at its beginning stages.

We have already responded to the passages of the Fathers that either assert, or at least do not deny, that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of Solomon. Many add the fact that Antichrist is also going to sit in the churches of Christians; that is true and not opposed to our position. The Fathers would not have it that Antichrist is going to sit in the Church as a bishop, like the heretics dream up, rather he is going to sit as a god. Antichrist will command all temples of the world to be converted to his worship, and he will make his own person worshiped. "He will command" (says Chrysostom on this citation), "himself to be worshiped as a God, and

to be venerated and placed in the temple, not only in Jerusalem, but even in the churches.” The rest speak in the same way.

Now to the arguments taken up from the words of St. Gregory the Great, I respond: from his words we deduce the contrary to those which the heretics have mustered. They argue thus: The bishop of Constantinople was a precursor of Antichrist, because he made himself universal bishop; therefore, Antichrist will be some universal bishop, who will usurp all things to himself. But the opposite is gathered, since a precursor ought not be the same with the one he foreshadows, but by far lesser, even if in some matter he is similar to him just as we see in John the Baptist and Christ. So if he is a precursor of Antichrist, who makes himself universal bishop, the true Antichrist himself will not make himself this, but something greater; without a doubt he will extol himself over everything that is called God. Or if the true Antichrist will only make himself a universal bishop, then John of Constantinople, who did this, was not a precursor of Antichrist, but the true Antichrist, which still Gregory never says, nor our adversaries. So the sense of the words of Gregory is that because Antichrist will be very proud, and the head of all the proud, so also he will suffer no equals; whoever usurps something not due to him and wishes to go beyond and be over others, he is a precursor to him. Such were the bishops of Constantinople, who, although in the beginning were only an archbishop, first usurped the title of patriarch, and then the title of universal.

With equal reasoning, when Gregory says: “an army of priests is prepared for him,” he did not mean priests as in “priests pertain to the army of Antichrist”, since he will gather his own in that army;; but priests as in the proud prepare an army for Antichrist, since he speaks on the same John and priests like him that elevated themselves unjustly above the rest. It does not follow that Antichrist will be a prince of priests, but prince of the proud.

From this chapter we have an outstanding argument that the Pope is not Antichrist, seeing that his seat is not in Jerusalem, nor in the temple of Solomon; nay more, it is believable that from the year 600 to the present (1589) no Roman Pontiff has been to Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XIV: On the Doctrine of Antichrist

ON the doctrine of Antichrist there is a great deal of controversy between us and the heretics. It is certain from the Scriptures as well as from the testimony of our adversaries that there are going to be four points of doctrine of Antichrist.

1) He will deny that Jesus is the Christ and hence he will oppose all the things our Savior established, such as Baptism, Confirmation, etc. He will teach that circumcision and the Sabbath have not yet ceased, as well as other ceremonies of the old law. “Who is a liar, but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? And this is Antichrist, who denies the Father and the Son, etc.” [181](#)

2) After he will have persuaded the world that our Savior is not the true Christ, then he will assert that he is the true Christ promised in the law and Prophets. “If anyone will come in my name, you will receive him,” [182](#) that is as the Messiah.

3) He will declare that he is God and will demand to be worshiped as a god. “So that he shall sit in the temple, showing himself just as if he were God.” [183](#)

4) He will not only say that he is God, but even that he alone is God and will oppress all other gods, i.e., both the true God and false gods, and all idols. “Who extols himself over everything which is called God, or that is worshiped.” [184](#) And in Daniel: “He will not think God is his father, nor will he worship anything of the gods, because he will rise against them all.” [185](#)

All of these are true in some manner and pertain to Antichrist; even our adversaries agree with us on this point. But the question is on the understanding of these four points. For Catholics understand simply according to the words of Scripture that Antichrist is going to deny the true Christ; he is going to make himself Christ; he is going to preach that he is

God; and he will curse all other Gods and idols. From these four arguments we endeavor to show the Pontiff is not Antichrist. It is certain the Pope does not deny Jesus is Christ, nor has he introduced circumcision, or the Sabbath in place of Baptism, and the day of the Lord. In like manner, it is certain the Pontiff has not made himself Christ or God, and it is especially certain, that not only has he not made himself God (since he clearly worships Christ and the Trinity), but our adversaries maintain that he also worships idols and images and dead saints.

Nevertheless, our adversaries by far read it otherwise. They say in the first place that Antichrist is not openly going to deny Jesus is the Christ by word, but by work, because under the appearance of Christianity and the Church he will corrupt the doctrine on the Sacraments, on justification, etc. Calvin says: “We gather the tyranny of Antichrist is such that he abolishes not the name of Christ or the Church, but rather uses the name of Christ as a pretext, and lurks under the name of Church as under a mask.” [186](#) The Centuriators of Magdeburg say: “Such is certain, that while professing Christ in doctrine he will still deny his office and merit... John shows that Antichrist is going to deny that Christ came in the flesh, this is, that Christ redeemed us wholly in his flesh and saved us; but that good works will confer salvation upon us.” [187](#) Next, they say Antichrist is not going to make himself Christ or God by his own word, but by work, because he will take up the place of Christ and of God, making himself head of all the faithful in the Church, which is proper to Christ alone. The Centuriators remark: “He will show himself for God, that he might be vicar of Christ and head of the Church, and can set up and tear away the articles of faith.”

Next, they say Antichrist is not going to reject idols; nay more, he shall openly adore them and they try to show from Daniel; after he had said Antichrist was going to rise against all gods, he adds: “He will venerate the god Moazim in his place, and a god whom their fathers did not know, he will worship with gold and silver and precious stones, etc.” [188](#) For Moazim, however, the heretics understand the Mass, images, relics and like things of ornate temples. So Illyricus argues in his book *Contra Primatum*.

Moreover, when the Apostle says that Antichrist is going to elevate himself above everything which is called God or which is worshiped, they try to prove this was written about the Roman Pontiff, who makes himself vicar of Christ and usurps greater authority than Christ had. Illyricus tries to

show it in his *Catalogue of Witnesses* (for I have not seen how the rest try to show it), page 3. Without a doubt, Christ declared nothing other than to show himself to be God; nay more, to effect that he and his cult is above God, which is to come in the name of Christ; from which it follows that the Pope, who offers himself for Christ's vicar, is himself the truest Antichrist. Likewise, Christ subjected himself to Scripture, he did and suffered such things that he would fulfill the Scripture, while the Pope said that he can dispense against the Apostle and the Evangelist, to make straight crooked and vice versa. This is the chief point especially of the side of the doctrine of our adversaries on Antichrist which rests upon the Scripture alone through new glosses incorrectly explicated. It is a clear indication of the matter that they cannot even cite one interpreter or Doctor for their side.

Then let us begin from the first argument that Antichrist is going to openly deny Jesus is the Christ by public profession, and inasmuch as all his Sacraments will have been discovered he will trample them under foot. It is proved: 1) from the aforesaid, chapter 5 & 6. For if Antichrist by nation and religion will be Jewish, and received by the Jews as a Messiah, as we have shown, certainly he will not preach our Christ, but will publicly oppose him. Otherwise, the Jews would receive our Christ through Antichrist, which is completely absurd. Besides, since there cannot be two Christs, how will Antichrist be able to thrust himself on the Jews as the Christ unless first he had taught that our Christ, who preceded him, was not really the true Christ?

2) It is proved from 1 John 2:22, "Who is a liar but he who would deny Jesus is the Christ? This is Antichrist." For all heretics who deny Jesus is the Christ are called Antichrists in some manner so, the true Antichrist himself will simply deny Jesus is the Christ in every way. It is confirmed because the devil is said to work the mystery of iniquity through heretics, because they deny Christ secretly, but the arrival of Antichrist is called revelation, because he will openly deny Christ.

It is also proved by the Fathers. Hilary says the devil tried to persuade men through the Arians that Christ was not the natural son of God, but adopted; yet through Antichrist he is going to try to persuade men that he was not even adopted, so as to utterly extinguish the name of the true Christ. [189](#) Hippolytus the martyr says that the character of Antichrist will be that men are compelled to say: "I deny Baptism; I deny the sign of the Cross," and similar things. Augustine asks whether men are going to be

baptized at all while Antichrist rages. At length, he answers: “Certainly they will be strong, both parents to baptize their children, and these who shall then first believe, that they shall conquer that strong one, even though he has been unbound.” [190](#) Here St. Augustine presupposes that Antichrist is not going to permit them to be baptized, and still some pious parents would rather suffer than that their sons should be unbaptized.

Jerome says in his commentary on Daniel chapter XI: “Antichrist will rise from a modest nation; that is, from the people of the Jews, and he will be so lowly and despised that he will not be given royal honor, but he shall obtain rule both through treachery and deceit. He will do this because he will feign himself the leader of the covenant, that is the law, and the covenant of God.” There, Jerome teaches that Antichrist is going to acquire rule over the Jews, because he will show himself zealous for the Judaic laws. Sedulius, commenting on 2 Thessalonians 2:6, says that Antichrist is going to restore all Jewish ceremonies so as to abolish the gospel of Christ. Gregory says: “Because Antichrist will compel the people to judaize so that he might restore the rite of the exterior law, he will want the Sabbath to be kept to place the faithlessness of the Jews in himself.”

Then, in the time of Antichrist, all public offices and divine sacrifices will cease on account of the vehemence of the persecution, as we showed above in chapter III. It is evident from this that Antichrist is not going to corrupt the doctrine of Christ under the name of a Christian, as the heretics would have it. Rather, he will openly assault the name of Christ and the Sacraments while introducing Jewish ceremonies. Since the Pope does not do that, it is evident that he is not Antichrist.

Moreover, Antichrist will say openly that he is the Christ by name, not his minister, or vicar, as is clear especially from the very words of the Lord: “If another will come in my name, you will receive him.” [191](#) There, the Lord seems to add on purpose “*in his own name*,” foreseeing that the Lutherans and Calvinists were going to say that Antichrist was not coming in his name, but in the name of our Christ as if he were his vicar.

Besides, the Fathers everywhere teach this. Irenaeus said: “He will try to show that he is Christ.” Ambrose says: “He will argue from the Scriptures that he is Christ.” [192](#) Theodoret says: “He will declare that he is Christ.” [193](#) St. Cyril of Jerusalem said: “He will induce a certain man to falsely

call himself the Christ, and through this title of Christ he will deceive the Jews who await him.” [194](#) All the Fathers, as we showed above, say Antichrist will be received briefly as a Messiah by the Jews; thus he will openly and by name make himself the Messiah, that is, the Christ. Hence the Roman Pontiff, who does not do this, as is known, is not Antichrist. For this very reason that he calls himself the vicar of Christ, he asserts that he is not Christ, but his minister.

The fact that Antichrist will openly declare himself to be God and desire to be worshiped as God, not only by usurping some authority of God, but by the name of God itself, is proved from the express words of the Apostle in 2 Thessalonians 2: “So that he will sit in the temple of God, revealing himself as though he were God.” Paul not only says that Antichrist is going to sit in the temple (for even we sit in temples yet still we are not Antichrists), but he even explains the manner in which he will sit, that he will sit as a god, the only one to whom the temple is properly raised. In Greek this is much more clear. For he does not say: *ōs theos*, as a god, but *hoti estin theos*, that is, revealing that he is God. All the Fathers so understand that verse.

Irenaeus says: “Proving to be an apostate and a robber, he will wish to be worshiped as if he were God.” Chrysostom said on that verse: “He will command that he be worshiped for God, and be placed in the temple.” He says elsewhere on this same verse: “He will confess himself as God of all.”

[195](#) Ambrose, commenting on 2 Thessalonians 2, said: “He will assert that he is God himself, not the Son of God.” They all explain the verse similarly. From that we understand that the Roman Pontiff, who does not claim to be God, but the servant of God, is not Antichrist.

Furthermore, Antichrist is not going to permit any god, whether true, false or an idol, and this is proved from the very words of Paul in the same passage: “Who is extolled above everything which is called God, or that is worshiped.” Here, we must remark that for “that which is worshiped,” the Greek is *sebasma*, which the Centuriators think means worship, that is, *the act of worshiping*, not *that which is worshiped*. From there, they try to show that the Apostle would have it that Antichrist is not going to adore idols, but is going to distort the worship of the true God by mutilating the Sacraments or by adding various ceremonies. Yet, certainly *sebasma* properly means not the act but the object, that is what is worshiped, such as an altar, shrines, idols, etc. Worship is *sebas*, or *thesebeia*, not *sebasma*. This is why the Paul

himself says in Acts 17: “*Dierchomenos gar kai anatheōrōn ta sebasmata hmōn euron kai bōmon*, etc.” He says “Disregarding and considering your idols, I discover the altar, etc.” Here Paul clearly means through *sebasmata* the very things that are worshiped, such as the shrines, altars and idols. We also read in Wisdom: *Kreitton gar estin tōn sebasmatōn autou ōn autos men ezēsen ekeina de ohudepote*. That is: “Man is better than the idols (*sebasmatōn*) which he made. For he lives for a time, but they do not.”

[196](#) I do not know from what source someone would so dare to twist things to deny that *sebasmatōn* means idols themselves, or simulacra, which men make with their hands: things that seem to have life when they do not live.

Therefore, all Greek texts (even that of Erasmus, whom all the heretics celebrate, both in his version and in annotations), teach that *sebasma* ought to be rendered as a god. Next, the words of Daniel are rather clear: “He will not worship any of the gods, but will rise against them all.” Jerome, writing on that verse, says this cannot be understood to mean Antiochus, as Porphyrius thought, because it is certain Antiochus worshiped the Greek gods; but it can be understood on Antichrist who will worship no god.

At last we come to the consensus of the Fathers. Irenaeus said: “Indeed he will put away the idols and will lift himself up as the one idol.” [197](#) Hippolytus from the same sermon on the end of the world says: “Antichrist will not permit idolatry.” Cyril of Jerusalem says: “Antichrist will hate idols.” [198](#) St. John Chrysostom says on this place in Daniel: “He is extolled above everything which is called God, or divinity. For he will not induce to idolatry.” Theophylactus, Oecumenius, and Theodoret all teach the same thing, and the last beautifully notes that the devil wondrously fools and is going to fool the sons of perdition. For of old he persuaded that there were many gods and that various idols must be worshiped, and in that way he took a great profit. In the time of Antichrist, however, because he will see that through the doctrine of Christ idols and the multitude of false gods have been expunged through nearly the whole world, he also will accuse idols and their multitude and in that way will still deceive men. In this it seems the Pope, who according to Catholics acknowledges God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and according to the heretics worships many idols, in no way can be called the Antichrist.

But they say Daniel chapter 11 affirms that the God Moazim must be worshiped with gold, silver and precious stones.

The first response is that though the god Moazim, which is interpreted as strength (that is, very strong), Antichrist himself can be understood. Accordingly, that “He will be venerated,” in Hebrew is not *yah-shea-ti-ka-veh*, he will worship, but *ya-ka-bed*, he will glorify. In the same way, in Psalm 90 (91) God says: “I will raise him and glorify him.” In Hebrew that is *eh-ka-bey-day-hu*, and certainly God is not going to glorify men by subjecting them to themselves but by exalting them. Therefore, Antichrist will glorify himself when he will be worshiped by all. For this reason the Septuagint renders this *doxasei*, and Theodoret expresses it in this way: “For this ‘Moazim’ means a strong and powerful god, and he will call himself this. For he placed it in his own place for himself. He will raise temples to himself, and adorn them with gold, silver, precious stones.”

The second response, which I prefer, is that Antichrist is going to be a magician and by the custom of other magicians he will worship the devil secretly, by whose work he will do wonders. He will call this one whom he is going to adore Moazim. Hence, for Moazim we do not think the name of a god, but of a certain strong and secret place in which the special treasures of Antichrist will be and where he will worship the devil himself. For it follows from Daniel that he will also see to it that he fortifies Moazim with a strong god whom he knows. And truly *ma-koz* means both a strong place and a citadel, as Nicholas Lyranus explains it. Moreover, it must necessarily be said that Antichrist is himself the god Moazim, or if he is someone else, Antichrist must worship him only in a very secret place, secret from all others. The very words of Daniel compel us that otherwise they would oppose themselves; if he will worship no god, how will he openly worship an idol?

Now, the two arguments of Illyricus are very weak. In the first argument he errs three times. First, he asserts that the words of Paul were explained by Christ, when it ought to be the other way around. Secondly, he errs in saying say in Matthew 24 that to come in the name of Christ means the same thing as to be the Vicar of Christ. For the very explanation of Christ is opposed to this argument of Illyricus. When the Lord says: “Many will come in my name,” soon he adds: “saying, I am Christ.” There, to come in the name of Christ is to usurp the name of Christ to one’s own person. Once, Simon Magus did this very thing, as Irenaeus witnessed, [199](#) and in

our times David Georgius. At length, Antichrist will do this very thing. But the Pope, because he calls himself the Vicar of Christ, does not make himself Christ.

Thirdly, Illyricus errs because he makes Christ an inept interpreter of Paul. For he does not rightly explain what Paul said: “Extol himself over every thing that is God” for the verse: “many will come in my name,” that is, as he sees it, make themselves my vicar. The vicar of God is not over everything that is God, but below it, just as the vicar of a king is below everything of the king. It cannot be thought or pretended that one who professes himself to be the vicar of some king will boast to be above all kings. From that we see the blindness and impudence of our adversaries who babble this nonsense which they would abhor in its common meaning.

Now, I respond to the argument of Illyricus, where he argued that the Pope usurped a greater authority than even Christ had. The proposition and assumption of this argument involves two lies, and besides the consequence avails to nothing. 1) It is false that Christ subjected himself to the Scriptures since it should be certain that he is the author of the Scriptures, and hence above them. Moreover, when we read Christ did what he did so as to fulfill the Scriptures, the *that* is not a cause but means the event, as Chrysostom and Augustine teach in chapter 12 of John. Christ did not die because Isaiah wrote this, but Isaiah wrote this because it was going to happen.

Next, it is also false that the Pope ever said by word or deed that he can dispense against the Evangelists or Apostles. For even if he can dispense on some precept placed by the Apostles, still this is not against the Apostle but according to him, who without a doubt knew the Apostolic power whereby he, being put in charge of something, stood in the Church for a time; and that there were going to be successors, that they could moderate or change the same things so long as it would be expedient for the Church. But no Catholic ever said a Pontiff can dispense in any way from the Gospel, i.e., the divine precepts.

Then the consequent is bad. In the major proposition Illyricus speaks on the subjection of Christ to the Scriptures, not in regard to precept, but to prophecies, while Illyricus is not ignorant that Christ abolished the Sabbath and abrogated the ceremonial law. Yet in the minor he speaks about precepts, and so the argument has four ends, and thence nothing can be concluded.

This will be sufficient in this place on the doctrine of Antichrist.

CHAPTER XV: On the Miracles of Antichrist.

HOLY SCRIPTURE contains three things about the miracles of Antichrist. 1) He is going to do many miracles. 2) These will be of some quality. 3) Three examples are posited. The Apostle teaches in 2 Thessalonians 2 that Antichrist is going to do miracles, saying: “His arrival will be accompanied by signs and wonders according to the operation of Satan.” The Lord says in the Gospel of Matthew: “They will give signs and great wonders, so that, if it is possible, even the elect will be led into error.” He said, “They will give,” not “he will give.” This is because not only Antichrist, but his ministers, will perform signs, to the extent that St. Gregory said even the torturers of the holy martyrs are going to perform signs and wonders at that time. [200](#) Next, in Apocalypse 13, “And he will perform great signs in the sight of men.” Paul explains what type they will be in Thessalonians, saying in one word, they will be lies: “In all power, signs and lying portents.”

Hence the signs will be lies by an account of all the causes, final, efficient, material and formal. For the end of those miracles will be to show Antichrist is God and the Messiah, which will be the most pernicious lie. Chrysostom teaches in this place, that these lies are called miracles because they will induce men to lie. And Ambrose in this place teaches that the purpose of the miracles of Antichrist are going to be that he will try to show himself to be God, just as our Christ proved his divinity with true miracles.

Next, the signs are called lies in regard to their efficient cause; for the principal efficient cause will be the father of lies, that is the devil. For the Apostle speaks thus: “His arrival according to the operation of Satan.” And all the Fathers assert Antichrist is going to be an outstanding magician. Moreover, the devil is going to dwell in him in his very conception, or at least from infancy, and through him perpetrate signs.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem also teaches that Antichrist is going to be a magician, and instructed in sorcery, incantations and evil arts, he shall

announce himself; his miracles are called lies because they begin from the father of lies. [201](#)

There will also be many lies from those by reason of the material cause, because there will be certain imaginary deceptions, as Cyril says above and Theodoret teaching on the same places of Scripture. For he will appear to raise the dead and heal the sick, but they will be illusions of demons, not true miracles. Due to the fact that in Apocalypse 13 Antichrist is said to be going to do miracles in the sight of men, i.e., appearances and delusions in the sight of men, not solid and true as Arethas remarks in the same place.

Next, there will be certain lies from those miracles by reckoning of the form, although they will be true from a reckoning of the matter, because it will seem that true things will be worked, but they will not conquer the power of the whole nature. Therefore, they will not formally be true miracles. True miracles are only called those which can be done by God, that is, which do not have natural causes, nor secret or manifest ones. Therefore, these miracles are not only in the sight of men, but even in the sight of demons and angels. But the miracles of Antichrist will all have natural causes, though they be secret from men.

In the Apocalypse, [202](#) they place three examples of the miracles of Antichrist. One, that he will cause fire to come down from heaven. The second, that he will make an image of the beast speak. Third, that he will feign himself to be dead and resurrect. Due to these particular miracles nearly the whole world will admire him.

From such miracles there will be two true earlier ones (true in regard to matter, not form), but the third will be no miracle at all.

Moreover, it could be objected against this that they do not all seem to be miracles attributed to Antichrist. For John, in that place, introduces two beasts, one which has seven heads, one of which seems to be dead and rises again. The second smaller one makes fire descend from heaven and the image speak. Therefore, if Antichrist will be before the beasts, these two miracles of the fire and image are not attributed to him; if he will be later than the beast, then the miracle of the resurrection cannot be attributed to him.

I respond: the first beast means either the Roman Empire or the multitude of the impious, as we said above, while one that is the head which seems to be dead and resurrects, is Antichrist. He will also be the supreme

and last head of the impious; he will be the last king who will hold the Roman Empire, still without the name of Roman Emperor. And the Fathers teach that this feigned miracle of the resurrection is also certainly to be attributed to Antichrist. [203](#) St. Gregory argued in an epistle against Lyranus, who thought it was about the son of a certain Cusro, the King of Persia, whom he pretended was wounded in a battle but still not killed.

[204](#) For no other proven history relates such a tale about the son of Cusro, nor can what follows in the Apocalypse agree with the son of Cusro: “And the whole world will admire the beast, saying who is like the beast?”

Hence, the second beast in the Apocalypse, according to Rupert, means the same Antichrist. The same Antichrist is expressed through two beasts: The first by reason of royal power and tyranny, whereby he will violently compel men; the other by reason of magical arts whereby he will subtly seduce men. Still, according to Richardus, Anselm and others, the second beast means the preachers of Antichrist, who will try to show with miracles that Antichrist is the true Messiah. Therefore, all these miracles will be either of Antichrist, or of his ministers. Thus, it follows that the Pope is not Antichrist, seeing that no Pontiff has ever feigned that he was dead and risen again, nor has he or any of his ministers ever made fire come down from heaven or an image speak.

But the Centuriators object that the Pope has made many lying miracles: “Such as visions of souls talking from purgatory, and asking Masses to be said for them and the healing of plagues, such as happened to those worshiping statues or calling upon the saints.” [205](#)

I respond: In the first place, these are not the miracles which John writes that Antichrist is going to do; he will die and rise, make fire fall from heaven and to give the power of speech to an image. Therefore, let them show any Pope who did these signs, let alone any bishop. Next, these three kinds of things that they say are the miracles of Antichrist were used in the Church before that time in which our adversaries said Antichrist came openly. St. Gregory writes about Paschasius the Deacon, who lived in the time of Pope Symmachus, around the year 500. [206](#) His soul appeared to St. Germain, the bishop of Capua, asking the bishop to pray for him so that he might be freed from the torments of purgatory. Certainly, this miracle happened a hundred years before “Antichrist appeared,” in the opinion of

all the heretics of this time. For no man places the arrival of Antichrist until after the year 600 and around the death of Gregory I. The same Gregory relates other apparitions of souls, asking for Masses. [207](#)

On the miracles of healing from the veneration of images, Eusebius relates an example of a bronze statue made of the Savior in the spot where the Lord cured a woman from the flow of blood. A certain plant customarily grew under that statue which rose even to the fringes of the image, and it cured anyone who touched it of all types of evils. [208](#) It is evident from such a miracle that God wished to approve the cult of holy images.

On the healing divinely conceded to those who had vowed something to the saints, there are innumerable testimonies among the Fathers and an outstanding testimony is extant in Theodoret. He writes that in his own time the temples of the martyrs were full of pictures or simulacra of hands, feet, eyes, heads and other human members, whereby various gifts of healing were shown, which men received from the holy martyrs for a matter of devotion. [209](#)

CHAPTER XVI: On the Kingdom and Battles of Antichrist.

WE READ four things in the Scriptures about the kingdom and battles of Antichrist. 1) Antichrist shall come forth from the lowest place and will receive the rule over the Jews by frauds and treachery. 2) He is going to fight with three kings, namely over Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia, and at length will occupy their kingdoms. 3) He is going to add to himself seven other kings, and in that way evade the monarchy of the whole world. 4) With a countless army he will persecute Christians throughout the world, and this is the battle of Gog and Magog. It manifestly follows that none of these things agree with the Roman Pontiff, so that he in no way can be called Antichrist. Daniel speaks on the first point: "He will stand, despised in his place, and neither honor nor royalty will be given him, and he will come secretly and obtain a kingdom in deceit." [210](#) St. Jerome writes in this place that these are also understood as concerning Antiochus Epiphanies; still by far they are more perfectly fulfilled in Antichrist. In just the same way, the things which are said in Psalm 71 (72) about Solomon are understood on Solomon himself, but are more perfectly fulfilled in Christ. For that reason the same Jerome, after he had shown this place on Antiochus, having followed Porphyrius, so added: "We, however, interpret better and more rightly that in the end of the world Antichrist is going to do this, who has his rise from a small nation, that is, the people of the Jews, and will be so lowly and despised that royal honor would not be given him, and through plotting and deceit he shall obtain rule, etc." Jerome means, this is the common exposition of Christians. Daniel in chapter 7 also compares Antichrist with a small horn because of its worthless and obscure beginning.

Yet this definitely does not agree with the Roman Pontiff in any manner, or it would be necessary for one to say that the Roman Pontiff, even to the year 600, was very obscure and of no name, and then quickly through deceit began to occupy some high place, but this is certainly false. For as Augustine says: "In the Roman Church the rule of the Apostolic See always

flourishes.” [211](#) Prosper of Aquitaine said: “Rome is made greater through the rule of priesthood in the citadel of religion, than in the throne of power.” [212](#) And the Council of Chalcedon, in an epistle to Leo, asserted that at Rome the apostolic rays shine so that from there they expand to all and communicate their goods with everyone else. Next, even the heathen writer Ammianus Marcellinus, writing on the schism of Damasus and Ursicinus, says that he did not marvel if men contend with such zeal for the Roman Pontificate, since it has such power and importance.

Daniel speaks on the second point in chapter 7: “I considered the horns and behold, that small horn arose from the midst of the others, and tore out three from the first horns from his face. ... Hence the ten horns will be ten kings and another will rise after them. He will be more powerful than the first, and he will lay the three kings low.” And explaining who these three kings are in chapter 11: “He will send his hand into the earth and the land of Egypt will not put him to flight, and he will be in control of the treasures of gold, silver and all the precious things of Egypt. He will also pass through Lybia and Ethiopia.” St. Jerome, writing on these citations, and especially chapter 7, says: “Let us say what all Ecclesiastical writers hand down, that at the end of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans was to be destroyed, there were going to be ten kings who divide the Roman world amongst themselves, and an eleventh little king (Antichrist) was going to rise up who was going to conquer three of the ten kings, that is Egypt, Africa and Ethiopia; after they are dead, the other seven kings will submit their necks to the victor.” Other Fathers writing on Daniel 7 and 11 teach the same thing on the three kings killed by Antichrist. [213](#)

This especially refutes the insanity of the heretics who argue the Pope is Antichrist. Let them say, if they can, at what time the Roman Pontiff slew the kings of Egypt, Lybia and Ethiopia, and occupied their kingdom? Theodore Bibliander, in his *Chronicle*, says that the Roman Pontiff is just as a little horn that first tore off one of the horns from the beast when Gregory II excommunicated the Greek Emperor Leo the Iconoclast, and forbade taxes to be rendered to him from Italy, and little by little occupied his territory, that is, he obtained the Exarchate of Ravenna. Second, he says the horn tore off another when Pope Zachary deposed Childeric, the king of the Franks, and commanded Pepin to be made king in his place. He does not say the third clearly, but seems to indicate that the third horn was torn off

when Gregory VII excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Henry IV. There is a certain epistle extant from Emperor Frederick II, written against the Pope, in which he asserted three horns had been torn out by Antichrist, the kingdoms of Italy, Germany and Sicily, which the Roman Pontiff especially compelled to serve him.

But these are most untrustworthy. For in the first place, Daniel does not speak about France or Germany, but Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia. Next, no Pope has ever killed their kings, but Antichrist will kill three kings, as St. Jerome says. Besides, Antichrist will take possession of their kingdoms, not hand them over to others. Yet the Pope did not take the kingdom of France for himself, but gave it to Pepin and after deposing the Emperor, bid another to be created; so he did not usurp the empire to himself. In like manner, when the Pope deprived Emperor Leo of the rule of Ravenna he did not take possession of it himself, but permitted it to the kings of the Lombards. Pepin, after the Lombards were conquered, gave it to the Pope. Next, if to depose princes is to tear out the horns, there will not be three, but many more torn out by Antichrist. For it is certain that apart from Leo III, Childeric and Henry IV, the Popes have deposed many others: Innocent III deposed Otho IV; Innocent IV deposed Frederick II. All six of these lost their empire.

On the third, we have the clear testimony of the Fathers. Lactantius and Irenaeus say that after three of the ten kings will be killed by Antichrist, the other seven will be subjected and he will be the ruler of them all. [214](#) Jerome remarking on chapter 9 of Daniel where it says, “And he will do what his fathers did not,” says: “None of the Jews except for Antichrist will ever have ruled the whole world.” Chrysostom asserts in his commentary on 2 Thessalonians 2 that Antichrist was going to be a monarch and succeed the Romans in Monarchy, just as the Romans succeeded the Greeks, the Greeks the Persians, and the Persians the Assyrians.

Next, St. Cyril of Jerusalem says that Antichrist is going to obtain the monarchy which beforehand was of the Romans. [215](#) This is sufficiently deduced from the opinion of the Fathers and Apocalypse, chapter 17, where we read: “And ten horns, which you saw, are ten kings. These have one plan, and power, and they will hand their rule to the beast.” That this in no way agrees with the Roman Pontiff is certain. For the Pope was never a king over the whole world.

On the fourth, John says in the Apocalypse, chapter 20: “And the thousand years were ended; Satan was freed from his prison and went out, and seduced the nations, which are over the four corners of the earth with Gog and Magog, and he will gather them into battle, the number of which is like the sand of the sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and surrounded the camp of the saints and the chosen city. And fire came down from heaven and devoured them, and the devil, who seduced them, was sent into the lake of fire and sulphur, where both the beast and the false prophets were tortured day and night for ever and ever.” In these words the last persecution and its end are described. St. Augustine says the following about this: “This will be the last persecution before the impending judgment, which the holy Church will suffer throughout the world, the whole city of Christ by the whole city of the devil, in whatever degree each will be over the earth.” [216](#) Similar things are in Ezechiel 38 and 39, which must be briefly explained on account of the many errors that arise from it.

CHAPTER XVII: On Gog and Magog.

HEREFORE, the first opinion, or rather error, is of the Jews, who teach that Gog is Antichrist, and Magog is the innumerable Scythian nations that hide within the Caspian mountains. Gog is going to come, that is Antichrist, with Magog, that is, with this army of Scythians, in the time which the Messiah will appear in Jerusalem; and then battle will be joined in Palestine, and there is going to be such a slaughter in the army of God, that for seven years the Jews will have no need to cut wood from trees to build fires because they will have spears, shields and like instruments thrown down everywhere with dead bodies, and then the golden age will come.

Jerome relates this opinion while commenting on chapter 38 of Ezechiel, as well as the writings of Peter the Galatian, [217](#) and Rabbi David Khimhi in their commentaries on the Psalms. Firstly, what they think is the coming battle of Gog and Magog that will take place is the first coming of Christ, confounding the first with the second, since the Scriptures clearly teach in the first coming Christ is going to come with humility, and finally will be immolated just as a tame sheep. [218](#) Secondly, that they think Antichrist is going to come to fight against them and with their Messiah is erroneous, since Antichrist really is going to be their Messiah, and will fight against the true Christ, our Savior, on behalf of the Jews.

The second opinion is of Lactantius, who thinks the battle of Gog and Magog is going to be a thousand years after the death of Antichrist. [219](#) He teaches that Antichrist is coming six thousand years from the beginning of the world and will reign for three and a half years. Then Antichrist must be killed; Christ will appear and the resurrection is going to happen, and the saints will rule with Christ there for a thousand years in the greatest peace and tranquility; meanwhile the infidels will not be exterminated, but will serve them peacefully. Again, after a thousand years the devil will be loosed again, and a most atrocious war will be aroused in all nations, where those who served the saints for a thousand years will fight against the same saints, and this is the battle of Gog and Magog, about which Ezechiel and John

speak. But a little while later, all the impious will be slaughtered and then the second resurrection is going to take place, and the world will be completely renewed.

This opinion was also of many of the older Fathers, such as Papias, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Apollinaris and of a few others, as Jerome relates in chapter 36 of Ezechiel, and Eusebius. [220](#) But for a long time it had been refuted as an investigated error. For the Lord clearly teaches that after the persecution of Antichrist the last judgment will immediately follow. [221](#) Then, all the good are going to eternal life, while all the wicked into the eternal fire, hence there is not going to be another thousand years, nor any battle. [222](#)

The third opinion is of Eusebius. He thought that Gog is the Roman emperor, and Magog his empire. But this rests upon a false foundation, for he deduces this opinion from chapter 24 of Numbers, where according to the Septuagint we read: “The kingdom of Gog will be lifted up, and his kingdom increased. God led him from Egypt, etc.” There the Scripture seems to say that when Christ will return from Egypt in his time of infancy, then the kingdom of God will be lifted up. But it is certain that while Christ was an infant no kingdom was lifted up except that of the Romans.

But without a doubt this has been corrupted in this edition of the Septuagint. For the Hebrew does not have Gog, but Agag: *vey-ya-dom me-agag ma-ley-ko*, “and it will be abolished on account of Agag,” or his king before Agag. And the sense is, according to Jerome, commenting chapter 38 of Ezechiel, that the first King of Israel, Saul, was removed on account of Agag because he will sin by not killing him. Or according to others, Saul will be raised up before Agag, that is he will prevail and conquer Agag himself. Both are true, and that citation of Numbers is certainly understood to be about the kingdom of the Jews, not about Christ or the Romans. For it begins: “How beautiful are thy tabernacles, O Jacob, thy tents, O Israel, etc.”

The fourth opinion is of others, who understand the wars of the devil through Gog and Magog and his angel, formerly completed in heaven with the good angels. Jerome refutes this, just as he refutes the literal argument in chapter 38 of Ezechiel.

The fifth is of Theodore Bibliander whom Chytraeus follows in his commentary on Apocalypse 20. Therefore, Bibliander in his *Chronology*,

accurately treats on Gog and Magog, and at length teaches that the prophecies of Ezechiel and John do not pertain to the same time. Instead, the prophecy of Ezechiel was fulfilled in the time of the Maccabees, whereas Gog and Magog were Alexander the Great and his posterity that were kings of Syria and Egypt that enjoined battles with the Jews and at length were conquered by the Maccabees. But the prophecy of John was fulfilled in the time of Pope Gregory VII and as many pontiffs who followed him, thus Gog and Magog were Popes, and other Christian princes and their armies, who so long fought against the Saracens for the holy land, and to recuperate the tomb of the Lord. [223](#) The first part of this opinion is also that of Theodoret in his commentary on Ezechiel 38, but it cannot be defended. Firstly, because without a doubt the prophecies of Ezechiel and John are one and the same, and hence each must be fulfilled after the coming of Christ. For John says the army of Gog is going to come from the four corners of the earth; Ezechiel says the same thing, namely showing the army of Gog is going to be Persians from the East, Ethiopians from the South, Tubal, that is, Spanish from the West, and Togorma, that is, Phrygians from the northern parts. Next John says that this army must perish from fire sent from heaven, and Ezechiel asserts the same thing at the end of chapter 36. "Fire and sulphur will rain above him and over his army." Next, John adds to this battle the renewal of Jerusalem, that is, the glorification of the Church and in a similar vein Ezechiel from chapter 40 even to the end of the book treats on nothing but the wonderful renewal of Jerusalem.

Besides it is proved in the second place that the prophecy of Ezechiel was not fulfilled in the time of the Maccabees. In Ezechiel 38, it is said to Gog "you will come at the end of your years." But Alexander the Great came in the middle of his years. Next, Ezechiel says that in the army of Gog there are going to be Ethiopians, Libyans, Spanish, Cappadocians, etc, who still never fought against Jerusalem, and particularly not in the time of the Maccabees. For the Syrians and Egyptians alone fought against them.

Next, Ezechiel describes such a victory against Gog and Magog, that afterwards there would be no fear of enemies; rather it was going to be the end of all battles. But such was not the victory of the Maccabees against the kings of Syria and Egypt. For the Jews never completely conquered the kingdom of Syria or Egypt, and a little after the Jews were again disturbed by the Romans, captured and never freed from their hands, as Augustine

deduced from the history. [224](#) Therefore, the prophecy of Ezechiel was not fulfilled before the times of Christ.

The second part of the opinion of Bibliander, which is his own, is not only false but impious. For in the first place John speaks of the battle of Gog and Magog that is going to be against the camp of the saints, and the chosen city, that is, against the true Church of God. But the war of Christians to recover the Holy Land was wholly against Muslims, unless by chance Bibliander would have it that the Muslims are the true Church of God and the camp of the saints. Next, John says that men are going to be in the army of God from the four corners of the earth, but in the Christian army they were only from the West and the North, that is French, Germans and Italians. Besides, John says that after the war of Gog and Magog Jerusalem would be renewed and glorified; the devil, Antichrist and the false prophets are going to be cast out into the eternal fire. On the other hand, the war of the Christians for the Holy Land ended long ago, and still we have not seen any renewal of Jerusalem, nor the devil and the false prophets thrown into hell. For now, as even our adversaries affirm, the devil and the false prophets greatly flourish.

Besides, God himself manifestly showed by means of clear signs and wonders, both at Antioch in Syria, and on other places, that he was pleased by that war. [225](#)

Next, St. Bernard, whom the same Bibliander calls a saint in his chronicle, where he treats on the times of Eugene III, was one of many authors of this war. For he persuaded a multitude of French and Germans by words and miracles to set out for that war, as he himself shows. [226](#) The author of the life of St. Bernard writes that after the battle was completed Bernard gave sight to a certain blind man in testimony that the war he had preached was in the name of the Lord. [227](#)

The sixth opinion is of the Centuriators, who teach that Gog and Magog mean the kingdom of the Saracens or the Turks. [228](#) Such an opinion is plainly opposed to that of Bibliander and therefore, it is better or at least less bad. Yet still, it is absolutely false. Gog will come in the end of his years and will not endure for a long time, as is gathered from John and Ezechiel. But the kingdom of the Saracens began a long time ago and has endured for nearly a thousand years, which is by no means a little while.

The seventh opinion is of St. Ambrose. He taught that Gog represents the Goths, who had devastated many provinces of the Roman people. [229](#) St. Jerome calls to mind this opinion and says: “Whether it may be true or not, the end of the battle will show.” [230](#) And now rightly the end of the battle shows that it was not true, since after the wars of the Goths we saw neither a renewal of the Church nor did all wars end.

The eighth opinion is of St. Jerome himself. While commenting on chapter 38 of Ezechiel he saw the difficulty of the matter and expressed it in the mystical sense on heretics after he omitted the literal sense. For he would have it that Gog, which in Hebrew means roof, signifies heresiarchs who have the character of a roof; they are elevated and proud. Magog, on the other hand, since it is translated “from the roof,” means those who believe heresiarchs and are to them as a building is to its roof. This opinion, provided it is received in a mystical sense, is very true, but it is not literal. Ezechiel says that Gog is going to come in the end of years and John says in Apocalypse 20 that after a thousand years the same Gog is coming. (However, all Catholics understand the thousand years as the whole time which is from the arrival of Christ even to Antichrist.) Therefore, since Gog is not going to come until the end of the world, and the heretics began in the beginning of the Church while the Apostles were still alive, it is properly certain that Gog does not literally mean heretics. It must also be known that Jerome, when he says Gog means roof and Magog means from the roof, did not wish to say that Gog and Magog were the Hebrew for our words roof and from the roof. Rather, he meant they are almost the same. Properly in Hebrew roof is not *Gog*, but *Gag* גג and for from the roof they do not say *Magog*, but *Miggag* מגג.

The ninth opinion is of St. Augustine. He understands for Gog the devil, who is the character of a great roof, that is, of a great house in which many of the wicked inhabit; while for Magog he understands the army of Antichrist gathered from all the nations of the whole world. [231](#) Such an opinion without a doubt is the truest and must be embraced, insofar as it relates to Gog and Magog in the times of Antichrist. Both because all Catholic authors follow him, but also because everything which they say on Gog and Magog from Ezechiel and John rightly agree with Antichrist. For then, there will be truly the last and greatest persecution, and after it Jerusalem will be renewed, e.g. the Church will be glorified and no more

wars are heard of. Insofar as he understands the devil for Gog it does not seem to be true. For John says the devil, being freed, is going to call Gog and Magog into battle; therefore, the devil is one thing, Gog is another.

Therefore, our opinion, which is the tenth, contains three things. Firstly, we assert that the battle of Gog and Magog is the battle of Antichrist against the Church, as Augustine rightly teaches. Secondly, we say it is probably quite true that Antichrist is signified by Gog while through his army, Magog. For Ezechiel perpetually calls Gog the prince, and Magog the land, or nation. Thirdly, we say it is probable that Gog is called by Magog, not the other way around, so that Antichrist should be called Gog, because he is the prince of the nation which is called Magog. Hence, the army of Antichrist is called Magog from the nation of Scythia not because it is certain to be made of Scythians, which the Jews mean by beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea, but either because a great part of the army of Antichrist will consist of barbarians arising from Scythia (such as Turks, Tartars, and others), or what I rather more believe, because it will be an immense army and very cruel. For those whom we wish to say are savage, we call Scythian.

Now, that Magog really means a Scythian nation is clear from Genesis 10, where we read that the second son of Japhet was called Magog, whereby it was called the region of Magog, which his posterity inhabited; which is Scythia as Josephus taught, [232](#) as well as St. Jerome. [233](#) This is the same as from the three sons of Cham, that is, Chus, Mizraim and Chanaan: Ethiopia was called Chus, Egypt was called Mizraim, and Palestine was called Chanaan; thus from the son of Japhet, Scythia was called Magog.

Moreover, when Ezechiel names Magog he regarded a nation denominated by Magog, the son of Japhet, because he adds as allies to it Gog and other nations denominated by other sons, or grandchildren of Japhet, such as Gomer, Togorma, Mosoch, Tubal, etc. Therefore, we conclude that the battle of Gog and Magog is the last persecution which Antichrist will excite against the Church in the whole world.

What Ezechiel says in chapter 38 is also not opposed to this, that the arms of Gog and Magog will be burned for seven years, since still it will be certain that after the death of Antichrist there will be but 45 days until the end of the world, as is gathered from Daniel. For Ezechiel does not speak

literally, but figuratively as is the custom of prophets. He did not really mean that those arms would be burned for seven years, but that the slaughter would be so great that one could suffice for a very long time to keep the fires going with spears and shields of the slain men, if one needed to.

One doubt remains, whether on account of the savage persecution of Antichrist the faith and religion of Christ must be thoroughly extinguished throughout the world. Domingo de Soto believes that it is going to happen: “The loss and defection of the whole world from that see will be a sign of the end of the world. ... After the faith has been extinguished through the defection from the Apostolic See, the whole world will be empty and then continue in vain. ... Mortals will become frightened, as their love shall be pestilent. Thence its glorification and pride which under the leadership of Antichrist will at length cause the city of God to shake.” [234](#)

But, in my judgment, this opinion cannot be defended. For in the first place it is opposed to what Augustine says, that the Church is going to always be unconquered by Antichrist: “He will not desert his army which was called by the word ‘camp’.” [235](#) Next, it seems opposed to the Gospel, for we read in Matthew 16: “Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” But how will they not prevail, if they will utterly extinguish her? Likewise in Matthew 24, the Lord says on the ministers of Antichrist: “They will perform great signs, so that they will lead into error, and if it were possible, even the elect.” There, the Lord meant the many chosen in that future time that will not allow themselves to be seduced by the miracles of Antichrist. Next, all writers who speak on the persecution of Antichrist, such as Ezechiel, Daniel, Paul, John and all the Fathers cited above, say that the victory of this war or persecution is going to be in the power of the Church. And the reasoning is evident. Who would believe that in this battle, in which the whole camp where God and the devil, Christ and Antichrist will fight, that God will be conquered by the devil, and Christ by Antichrist?

CHAPTER XVIII: The Absurdities of the Heretics Are Refuted, in Which They Not Only Try to Show, but Impudently Declare That the Roman Pontiff Is Antichrist.

ALTHOUGH what we have treated up to this point on Antichrist could suffice, seeing that we have clearly shown that no place attributed to Antichrist in the divine Scripture agrees with the Supreme Pontiff, still so as to leave nothing wanting and because the impudence of our adversaries is so manifest, I propose briefly to refute that which Luther, Calvin, Illyricus, Tilman and Chytraeus assert trying to show that the Pope is the Antichrist.

1) Luther everywhere calls the Supreme Pontiff the Antichrist, and especially in his book *de Captivitate Babylonica*, in his work *Contra Execrabilem Bullam Antichristi*, in his assertion of articles, and in his book against Ambrose Catharinus. [236](#) Though he does this, only one argument can be found in all these books whereby he tries to prove this, namely in his assertion of article 27. He says: “Daniel foretold in the eighth chapter that Antichrist will be an impudent king by face, this is, as the Hebrew has it, powerful in regard to pomps and ceremonies of external works, meanwhile the spirit of faith is extinguished just as we saw fulfilled in so many religious orders, colleges, rites, vestments, deeds, churches, statues, rules and observances—and you can scarcely recite their number.” And these same faces of Antichrist, as he calls them, he enumerates and profusely explains in his book against Ambrose Catharinus on the vision of Daniel.

For all that, this argument of Luther errs in three places. First, in the very foundation, since the Hebrew word *sha-panim* [237](#) means “robust in the face,” and it is a Hebrew phrase that means a man with a smooth forehead who does not know how to be ashamed. For the Septuagint so renders it: *anaidēs prosōpō*, that is modest in the face. So also St. Jerome and

Theodoret render it, and Francis Vatablus so explained it in the *Rules of Rabbis*: “Strong in face, that is he who does not blush, who has no shame.”

Next, the same is gathered from Ezechiel 3: “The house of Israel has been rubbed clean in the forehead, and is hard of heart; behold I have given your face more vigor than their faces, and thy forehead is harder than theirs.” The Hebrew for that is: “The house of Israel is robust in its forehead, and I gave your face to be more robust than theirs.” The words have no other sense than this (as Jerome rightly explains): They are indeed impudent, but you shall not yield to their impudence. Although they boldly and without shame do wicked things, you boldly and without shame shall rebuke them. Since that is so, Luther should see to it lest he shall be impudent in face if he would have his interpretation be put before that of the rabbis, Theodoret, Jerome, the translators of the Septuagint and Ezechiel himself.

2) The argument of Luther goes astray because from this opinion, whatever at length he means, he does not rightly gather that the Pope is the Antichrist. Even if it were certain that Antichrist is going to be powerful in pomps and external ceremonies, it is still not immediately gathered that Antichrist is whoever comes in pomps and external ceremonies. The logicians teach that nothing can be gathered from affirmative particulars. Otherwise Moses would be the Antichrist because he established so many ceremonies in Exodus and Leviticus that one can hardly begin to count them. And when the same thing is said about Antiochus, and in his figure of Antichrist, that understanding is perhaps enigmatic. If the reasoning of Luther would avail, it would follow that all who could answer the enigma are Antichrist. But that is certainly false and ridiculous.

3) Luther errs in attributing the institution of all orders and ecclesiastical ceremonies to the Roman Pontiff, when it is certain that a great many of these were established by the holy Fathers, not by the Roman Pontiff. The Greek Church has always had, and still has, monasteries, rites, observances and ceremonies which they received from St. Basil, St. Pachomius and the other Greek Fathers, not from the Roman Pontiff. [238](#) In the West also we have the orders of St. Benedict, St. Romauld, St. Bruno, St. Dominic, and St. Francis which, while approved by the Pope, were established and devised by these holy men with the teaching of the Holy Spirit. So, if orders pertain to the face of Antichrist, these holy Fathers must rather more be called Antichrist than the Pope.

I add, lastly, that the words of Daniel (except in regard to revealing Antichrist in his own time), agree more suitably to no man better than Luther. For he was impudent in his face above all, for as a priest and monk he openly married a consecrated virgin, when no example of such a thing can be shown in all of antiquity. Likewise, he wrote lies without number which have been recorded and published by many. John Cochlaeus writes in the acts of Luther for the year 1523, that in one book of Luther he noted fifty lies. From another Luther was found to have placed 874 lies. Next, how great was his impudence when, in his book against the Bull of Leo X, Luther dared to excommunicate his Pope when the universal Church adhered to him still? Who ever heard that a priest could excommunicate a bishop?

To be sure, the Council of Chalcedon abhorred the rashness of a certain Dioscorus, who, while presiding over the Second Council of Ephesus (that is, the robber council of Ephesus), presumed to excommunicate Pope Leo the Great. Yet, what comparison can there be between Dioscorus, the Patriarch of the second See, presiding in what was supposed to be a general council, and Luther, a simple monk writing in his cell? Nevertheless, leaving Luther, we come to Melanchthon.

CHAPTER XIX: The Trifles of the Smalchaldich Council of the Lutherans Are Refuted.

HERE is a little book extant on the power and primacy of the Pope, or the reign of Antichrist, published in the name of the Smalchaldich Council of the Lutherans, which seems to me to be the work of Melanchthon. At any rate, whoever wrote it, it has nothing but words and inane boasting. The author of the book says: "It is certain that the Roman Pontiffs, along with their members, defend impious doctrine and impious worship, and this plainly fits the mark of Antichrist in the rule of the Pope and his members." To this point we have seen the proposition, now let us hear the proofs: "For Paul, when describing Antichrist in his letter to the Thessalonians, calls him the adversary of Christ, extolling himself over everything which is called or worshiped as God, sitting in the temple just as God. Therefore, he speaks of someone ruling in the Church not on heathen kings; he calls this man the adversary of Christ because he is going to devise doctrine opposed to the Gospel and he will arrogate divine authority to himself."

Though all these things, even if they were true, would hardly impede us still, I ask on what foundation does this interpretation rest? Paul clearly says Antichrist is going to elevate himself over every god and is going to sit in the temple, not as a king or as a bishop, but plainly as God, and Chrysostom, Ambrose and the rest of the fathers interpreting this passage concur with this. Therefore, by what principle does he affirm without a witness or any reasoning that Antichrist is he who sits in the temple not as God, but as a bishop, and does not raise himself above every god, to such an extent that he not only worships God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but even prostrates himself before the Sacrament of the Eucharist in the sight of all, as well as before the tombs of the Apostles, martyrs, the cross and images of Christ and the saints, which the author himself, although

impiously, usually calls foreign gods and idols? But let us see whether he can make this very thing fit the Pope.

“First, it is certain that the Pope rules in the Church and constituted this reign under the pretext of ecclesiastical authority and ministry. The pretext is these words: ‘I give to you the keys’.”

For certain he says that the Pope rules over the Church, but he does not prove it. On the other hand, we can show the contrary with little labor. One who rules suffers no superior, but the Pope professes that he is the vicar of Christ the King. And although in the whole house of God, and also in the whole kingdom of Christ he uses the fullest power, still this power is not in excess of the economy, rather it is the condition of a servant. For even Moses (as Paul says in Hebrews 3) “was faithful in the whole house of God,” but just as a servant, while Christ is as a son in his own. But let us continue.

“Thereupon, the doctrine of the Pope is in many ways opposed with the Gospel and he arrogates to himself divine authority in three ways. First, because he takes for himself the right of changing the doctrine of Christ and the worship established by God, and wills his own doctrine and worship to be observed as though it were divine.”

Likewise, he says this but does not prove it. Not only is this false, but it seems to be an impudent lie. Does he not know that in the Catholic Church the doctrine of Christ is taught by the mouth of all, and the worship cannot be changed not only by any man, but even by an angel, nor was there ever any question of whether what Christ taught or commanded should be believed or done. Yet it remains to be seen whether he or we interpret the doctrine and precepts of Christ better. In such a question he brings nothing other than his customary interpretation; but we bring the consensus of the Fathers, and of the Catholic Church, as well as decrees and customs. For we do not oppose the consensus of the Fathers and the decrees and customs of the Church (as he falsely boasts) let alone the Word of God, but only his interpretation and judgment. But let us hear the second proof.

“Secondly, because he takes power to himself not only to bind and loose in this life, but even the right over souls after this life.”

Again, this is said but not proven. For the Supreme Pontiff does not take the right unto himself over dead souls. He does not absolve their sins or punishments by his own authority but only in a manner such as prayers of intercession, and he will also share the good works of the faithful with

them. Moreover, prayers and fasting of the living benefit the dead, and especially the sacrifice of the Mass, as all the Fathers teach. On that matter we will dispute profusely elsewhere; in this place one testimony of St. Augustine will suffice. “It is without question that the dead are assisted by the prayers of the Holy Church and the salutary sacrifice, as well as almsgiving which is expended for their souls.” [239](#) Still, let us go on.

“Thirdly, because the Pope refuses to be judged by the Church or by another and advances his authority in judgment of councils and of the whole Church. This is to make oneself God, to refuse to be judged by the Church or by anyone.”

Here also, he says two things that he cannot prove. For particularly by what Scriptures, what councils, by what criterion ought the Pope be judged by councils or the Church? For we read (that I might pass over many other things which were disputed in the previous book) that Christ said to Peter: “Feed my sheep.” [240](#) We believe, it cannot be doubted, that the sheep must be ruled and judged by a shepherd, not the shepherd by the sheep. We also read that in Luke the Lord said to Peter: “Who do you think is the faithful and prudent steward, whom the Lord constituted over his household?” [241](#) We see in that passage a specific steward was proposed for the whole household of Christ, and certainly that he would rule it, not be ruled by it.

Still, perhaps someone would object that if that steward were wicked, in the end who will judge him if the steward is in charge of all but subject to none? That is why the Lord added immediately after: “What if that servant would have said in his heart, ‘My Lord delays his coming,’ and began to strike the servants and maidservants, to eat, drink and be drunk; the master of the servant will come on a day on which he hopes not, and at an hour which he does not know, and he will divide his lot and share it with infidels.” [242](#) Who does not hear that there is a judge of that wicked steward whom the Lord constituted over his household? Christ does not say that he will be judged by a council, but the “Lord will come on a day he hopes not, etc.” Therefore, the Lord reserves judgment for himself over the one he himself constituted over his whole household. Hence, the Pope does not steal his authority from the judgment of councils and of the whole Church when he does not suffer himself to be judged by it. He cannot steal

what was never given in the first place. Rather, councils duly gathered have never taken to themselves (outside the case of heresy), to pass judgment on the Supreme Pontiff. There is much to say on this matter in the proper place.

The second thing that he says and does not prove is that one makes himself God if he refuses to be judged by the Church or by anyone. For when he says “by anyone,” he certainly understands any man; does Melanchthon not know that the Pope must be judged by Christ himself, and that he believes and professes this? By what arrangement does someone make himself God when he believes God must judge him? Next, earthly kings attain judgment on earth in regard to matters of state; they recognize no one, and by his scheme, where he removes coercive power from bishops, these kings have no judge in ecclesiastical affairs. Will there not then be as many gods as there are kings? I do not think he is that insane that he would say this. Therefore, it remains that it is not true that one who would not be judged by any man thereby makes himself God.

Finally, he adds: “He defends such horrible errors and this impiety with supreme savagery, and he kills anyone who dissents.”

Since he lies so impudently here, let him also, if he can, recognize that I myself who write this openly assert—and at that in the very city of Rome (and not without the Pope’s knowledge)—that it is not lawful for the Pope to change Christ’s doctrine, or worship, or establish new worship which should be held as divine, or which is opposed with the Gospel by any reasoning. I am not killed for that, nor do I suffer on that account. Without a doubt the Pope knows well that I speak the truth, but Melanchthon lies. Just the same he also adds a little after: “The doctrine on penance has been altogether twisted by the Pope and his members; for he teaches that sins are remitted on account of the dignity of our works; in like manner they never teach that sins are remitted by grace on account of Christ.” These, however, are not our teachings but his lies. For we do not teach that, but altogether the contrary, as the Council of Trent clearly shows. [243](#) But enough has been said on this. Let us now turn to Calvin.

CHAPTER XX: The Lies of Calvin Are Refuted.

JOHN CALVIN, explaining 2 Thessal. 2: “He who extols himself over everything that is called God,” says many things with great flamboyance, but proves nearly nothing. “Paul means by these words that Antichrist was going to take as his own what is of the one God, that he will raise himself above everything divine and every god, that he might lay at his feet all religion and the whole worship of God. ... Now whoever will have been informed by the Scripture, even if he be a boy of but ten years, will notice certain things which are especially proper to God and which, on the other hand, the Pope usurps to himself, and he need not expend much labor to recognize him [the Pope] as Antichrist.” This shows wonderful promise!

But let us, at length, hear by what reasoning he shall prove what he proposes. Perhaps it will be of the kind that even a boy of ten years will not labor much to refute it: “The Scripture proclaims that God alone is the legislator [244](#) who can preserve and destroy, [245](#) one king whose office is to rule souls by his word; it makes the same one the author of all sacred things; it teaches that justice and salvation depend upon Christ alone; and it assigns the mode together with the reasoning. The Pope asserts that every one of these pertains to his right; and he boasts that what seems fit to him he binds upon consciences by means of laws and subjects them to eternal punishments. He establishes Sacraments at his pleasure which are either new or corrupted from the ones which Christ had established, and he vitiates, nay more, altogether abolishes these so that in their place he substitutes the sacrileges that he had made. A foreign means of attaining salvation is devised that is altogether foreign to the Gospel. Lastly he does not hesitate to change the whole religion at a nod. What, I ask, is it to raise oneself over everything which is called divine if the Pope does not do it?”

Did I not say that Calvin says much, but proves little or nothing? For Calvin says all this, that the Pope boasts to bind men with laws upon their consciences as he sees fit, that he establishes new Sacraments but abolishes

the old, that he devises a means of salvation foreign to the doctrine of the Gospel, that he changes all religion—but he does not prove any of it. In other words, for him to say something is to prove it; by equal reasoning to deny it ought to refute it.

Certainly, however, many of us are Catholic, and we obey the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ; we speak freely and without any injury to him that he is not allowed to bind men with any law he pleases, i.e. pernicious and wicked ones, neither can he establish new Sacraments nor corrupt or abolish the ones established by Christ, nor is he permitted to confect a means of salvation foreign to the doctrine of the Gospel, or overturn the Christian religion, or change it. We, in truth, more gladly say that we know he also thinks and says the same thing. For if he did not think so, if he thought he was allowed to fashion wicked laws, establish new Sacraments or abolish the old or do other things of this sort, how would he knowingly and willingly suffer us, who are in his power here in Rome more than in I know not what corner of the world, to teach the contrary?

But they will say the Pope does not say he is permitted to do these things, but still in reality he contends that he is by his deeds. Therefore, it should be proven that he has done any of these things. Otherwise, that is to assume what must be proven, which although customary for our adversaries, the logicians call “begging the question.”

Next, Isaiah 33 and James 4, the only two passages of Scripture that Calvin advanced, do not impede our position in the slightest. For Isaiah and James say: “One is king, judge and our lawgiver;” certainly that is not opposed with those words of Proverbs: “Through me kings rule and makers of laws determine what is just.” [246](#) And with these, the Psalm: “And now understand ye kings, you are taught to judge the earth.” [247](#) Another six hundred passages could be added. Therefore, Isaiah and James in whatever way do not make God the one king, judge and lawgiver, but only by reason that he alone is so King, Judge and Lawmaker that he ought to render an account to no one since he depends upon no one. He will rule and judge and impose laws by his own authority, i.e. he does not receive authority from another. Lastly, that he alone in regard to execution can destroy and save, as James says, we attribute none of that to the Pope or any other princes.

CHAPTER XXI: The Lies of Illyricus Are Refuted.

NOW we turn to Illyricus. In a book which he wrote against the primacy of the Pope, he says: "But among our other arguments it ought to be the most solid, truly and clearly proven that in this time, the Pope teaches and defends impious doctrine and is himself the very person of Antichrist, and I repeat the reasons of this matter here. 1 John 2 defines that Antichrist is he who denies Jesus is the Christ. The Pope clearly does this, not by words but by deed. Messiah is the Hebrew, Christ the Greek; it is a divinely sent person that he should be a perpetual priest and king over the people of God. The office of the priest is to teach, pray, sacrifice, but it is for a king to rule and defend."

Let us see how he will prove the Pope has snatched up these offices from Christ, and what testimony and proofs he advances. Still, unless I am mistaken, we will only see inane words. Therefore, he continues thus: "The Pope has seized the priesthood from Christ; not only does he wish to be heard as the beloved son, but what is more, he and his pseudo-apostles advance another Gospel. Likewise, he substitutes other mediators in heaven between us and Christ who intercede for us in the presence of the Father by neglecting the severe judge, Christ. Likewise, because he substitutes infinite sacrificing priests in place of Christ, who pleased God on behalf of the human race, to whom he says the priesthood passed from Christ through Peter. Thereupon, he wills us to be saved through their spiritual merits and those of the saints."

See how Illyricus conquers us with the clear proofs of Scripture! What if we were to show that all these things were merely lies? For where, I ask, have you read that the Pope wishes to be given more authority than Christ? We deny it and say: Prove it. Rather, we see that supreme honor is given to the Scriptures by the Pope and he holds for heretics those who teach something against Scripture. Next, is it not clearly a lie that the Pope has established other mediators for Christ and wants them to intercede with God the Father while neglecting Christ? Does our litany not begin with *Kyrie*

eleison, Christe eleison? Are not all the prayers of our Church, which we read in Mass or in the Divine Office directed to God and do they not end: “through Christ our Lord”? Do we not acknowledge the mediation and intercession of Christ when, whatever we ask from God, or if we desire the saints to be asked on our behalf, we ask entirely through the merit of Christ? We do not have saints in place of God or of Christ, but we ask from them that they might join their prayers with our own so that whatever we wish of God we might obtain more easily through Christ.

By equal reasoning it is a lie that the Pope substituted sacrificing priests for Christ. Neither would we say the priesthood of Christ has passed to sacrificing priests through Peter. He has not proved any of these things, nor will he ever prove them. There can be no doubt whether if you had some means you would advance it. But it is as we say, Christ, who is a priest forever, and lives always to intercede for us, offered himself once to God in a pleasing sacrifice by death on the cross, but now he offers himself again and again and again in the liturgy through the hands of the priests.

Just the same, although many in our time baptize, still we read that: “This is he who baptizes in the Holy Spirit.” [248](#) It does not follow that the office of baptizing passed from Christ to the priests, but that he is the one who always baptizes through the ministry of the priest; thus even though many priests today offer Christ in awe-inspiring mysteries, still, he is the primary priest and truly the high priest who through the ministry of all priests offers himself: “These works are not of human power. Who then in that supper consecrates, now also operates and perfects; we merely hold the rank of ministers.” [249](#)

But I would gladly say to Illyricus, since all the ancient writers both Greek and Latin make mention of the sacrifice of the Eucharist and of the Christian priesthood (which no man denies unless he does not read), why at length does he attribute this to the Roman Pontiff, that he transferred the priesthood of Christ to sacrificing priests? But let us continue with the rest.

He adds in the last passage: “He wishes us to be saved through their spiritual merits, and of the saints.” This is also a characteristic lie. Otherwise advance a place where the Pope will have said this. St. Peter says in Acts: “For we believe we are saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, just as even our Fathers were saved.” [250](#) Nor do we acknowledge any

other savior but Jesus Christ crucified who gave himself for the redemption for all. [251](#)

Hence, it cannot be denied that the merits and prayers of the saints benefit us according to their mode, unless one does not know or does not believe there is communication and connection among the members of the body of the Church. Although we will treat this matter in another place, it will suffice to add two testimonies here. St. Augustine says: “That we might be advised in that mode, should what we deserve so weigh us down that it seems we are not loved by God, we can relieve ourselves from it by the merits of those whom God loves.” [252](#) He also repeats often in *City of God* that some obtained forgiveness by the merits of the saints. [253](#) This is what the Lord meant when he said: “Make unto yourselves friends from the mammon of iniquity, that when you falter, they might receive you in eternal dwellings.” [254](#) St. Leo the Great says: “We believe and trust to obtain the mercy of God when we are oppressed by our own sins, that we are always, among all labors of this life in equal measure, in need of the help by the prayers of special patrons, we are raised up only by Apostolic merits.” [255](#)

Moreover, although we do not customarily so speak, as Illyricus says, that we are saved through spiritual merits, still, if anyone were to so speak and mean by the merits of the saints we are helped to obtain salvation through Christ, he could be no more rebuked than the Apostle Paul, who said: “I am all things to all men that I might save all.” [256](#) And the Apostle Jude, who speaks in a similar fashion said: “And indeed reprove those that have been judged, but save others, pulling them out of the fire.” [257](#) That is enough on the priesthood of Christ.

Nevertheless, Illyricus continues: “He steals the kingdom from Christ, because he wishes to be head of the Church on earth, but in heaven he constitutes other helpers and saviors for us, to whom he bids us to flee when in misery. Therefore the Pope denies Jesus is the Christ.”

First I ask where in the world the Pope, or any Catholic, calls the saints “saviors”? I add this: If he asserts that he is head of the Church under Christ, as his vicar and minister, which the Pope does, is that to deny Jesus is the Christ? By the same reasoning does anyone who is a viceroy, or

affirms himself as the governor of some province, thereupon deny his master is king?

Next, if to turn to the saints as helpers is to deny Jesus is the Christ, how, I ask, did Paul not deny Jesus is the Christ when he said: “I ask you, brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ and through the charity of the Holy Spirit, that you help me by praying for me to God, that I might be freed from the unbelievers who are in Judea.”? [258](#) How did Basil the Great not deny Jesus is the Christ when, in his *Oration on 40 martyrs*, he said: “Anyone who is oppressed in narrow straits, let him flee to them; again who rejoices, let him pray to them; that he may be freed from evils; that he would endure to prosperous times”? I omit the remaining Fathers, as I fear lest we might search too much and discover who else denied Jesus is the Christ.

Still, Illyricus continues. “In Daniel 11, Antichrist is distinguished by a great many signs; first, that he will do what he wants, and the Pope does what is pleasing to him.”

But when holy Daniel says of Antichrist, “He will do what he wishes,” he means Antichrist will have no one greater than he, not even God. For it follows: “And will be lifted up against every God.” Therefore, Antichrist will live for his own will in place of the law of God, and command and subordination. Certainly the Pope does not do this; rather he affirms that he is constrained by the law of God, and acknowledges Christ as his judge and superior.

Illyricus continues: “He confesses in canons [259](#) that he himself drags infinite souls with him into hell; still no man ought to say to him what he does? And the Gloss says the will of the Pope is held as the rule.”

The Canon that begins *Si Papa* was not (as Illyricus falsely says) written by any Pope, but by St. Boniface, the bishop of Moguntium, Apostle of Germany and a martyr. He does not deny that the Supreme Pontiff, if he will have lived badly, must be corrected and also admonished by fraternal charity; rather, he denies that he can be convicted by authority and judged when he is the judge of every man. In those words which come before that canon (as is seen in the new edition of the decree), Boniface also calls the Roman Church the *Head* of all Churches with eloquent words, and affirms that the safety of the whole Church, after God, depends upon the safety of the Roman Pontiff.

I ask, therefore, from Illyricus, whether the teaching of St. Boniface, the apostle of the Germans, is true or not? For if it is not true, why object to us? If it is true, why does he not receive it? I will put the matter more plainly. If his teaching is not true, therefore, it is not true that the Roman Pontiff drags a great many souls with him to hell. What then? But if it is true, then the Roman Pontiff is truly the head of all Churches and the judge of all, judged by no one. For this reason, Illyricus should cease to argue with canons which can benefit him nothing. What pertains to the Gloss, Illyricus should know, that citation was either held by the Pope as false and thus purged from the new edition, or else it was never in that decree; I could not find it anywhere.

Illyricus goes on: “Secondly (Daniel) says that he will lift himself above God. The Pope did that as is clear from the foregoing. Likewise, because he wishes to make himself heard more than God, blaspheming he loudly proclaims the Scripture the font of all heresy, schism, ambiguity and obscurity, etc.”

It would behoove him to at least relate the words of Daniel faithfully. It does not say he will lift himself above God, but “he will be lifted against every God.” And below: “Nor will venerate gods because he will rise against all of them.” This very clearly shows the Pope has nothing in common with Antichrist, since Antichrist will worship no gods but the Pope worships the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Not only that, but if we were to believe Illyricus then he openly worships as many gods as there are saints in heaven and images on earth, not to mention relics under the earth.

Moreover, when he adds: “The Pope loudly declares the Scriptures are the font of heresies and schisms,” I have certainly never read that in the writings of any Pope; but I have heard the word of Luther, that Scripture is the book of heretics. [260](#) If that were received in the right sense then I do not see why it would be duly condemned. For St. Hilary also, in his last book on councils, shows that a great many heresies were born from bad understanding of Scripture. Tertullian also boldly stated: “Nor am I trying to say that the Scriptures themselves were so arranged by the will of God as to furnish materials for heretics when I read ‘there must be heresies,’ which could not exist without the Scriptures.”

Not only does the Pope very truly teach that there is ambiguity and obscurity in a great many passages of Scripture, but so also do all the

Fathers. Even Luther himself, whether he wished to or not, was compelled to affirm this when he wrote in a preface to the Psalms: “I would not have it presumed by any man in my regard that I have done what still none of the saints or the most learned could furnish, i.e. to teach and understand the Psalter in its legitimate sense in all places. It is enough for some men to have understood some things for their part, but the Spirit has reserved many things to himself so that we would always have students. It only shows many things so as to attract, and hands down many things to influence. ... I know that anyone who would dare to profess that he had perfect understanding of one book of Scripture in all its parts would be guilty of the most impudent temerity.” Luther also writes the same thing in his book *de Conciliis et Ecclesia*, pag. 52. Does he not clearly affirm that he, with great sweat, sought the true and genuine teaching of Scripture? And, at length, are there not so many versions of Scripture, so many interpretations, so many different sects among our adversaries; why do they shout, on the other hand, how ambiguous and obscure the Scripture is?

“Third, [Daniel] says that things will go well for him [Antichrist] until the wrath of God shall put an end to them. The Pope oppressed as he willed both kingdoms and innumerable churches with his tyranny and impiety.”

And this is the reason by which the author proves his case? Could not someone say what states and which churches the Roman Pontiff has oppressed? What if we were to show the contrary, that this mark of the Pope were plainly contrary to this third mark of Antichrist? In that time, in which according to Illyricus, the Pope began to be Antichrist, not only did his rule not increase, but in fact it decreased all the more. In the time of Leo the Great, that is, one hundred and fifty years before our adversary says Antichrist was born, the Roman Pope presided over as many nations as there were boundaries of the Roman Empire. For he thus writes: “Through the holy See of Blessed Peter, Rome was made head of the world; you preside more broadly in divine religion than earthly domination. Although by many victories the authority of your rule increased, you conferred it over land and sea; still what bellicose labor has subdued for you is less than what Christian peace has added.” [261](#) And Prosper of Aquitaine says:

Rome, the See of Peter, which for pastoral honor
Was made head of the world,

Whatever she does not possess by arms
She holds by religion. [262](#)

Yet afterwards, while Antichrist was ruling (as Illyricus would have it) the Roman See little by little lost Africa, the greater part of Asia and all of Greece. In our own times they cry out that Antichrist is raging, yet all his affairs go so well that he has lost a great part of Germany, Sweden, Norway, all Denmark, a good part of England, France and Switzerland, Bohemia and part of the Balkans. Therefore, if things going well is a mark of Antichrist, it is not the Pope, who has lost so many provinces, but Luther, who by preaching carnal freedom has seduced so many people and for whom things go so well that from a private monk he became prophet of the whole of Germany; and just as the Pope evades it, he rightly can be called Antichrist. Nevertheless, continue.

“Fourthly, Daniel says ‘he will have no care of the God of his Fathers.’ This is truly said about the Pope, as we clearly proved above from the passage of John.”

And we more clearly disproved it in the same place.

“Fifthly, he says he will have no care for the love of women: but the Pope became celibate both by instructing celibacy to his own, and by his homosexual lusts.”

Here, I omit to say with what temerity Illyricus dares to say these things. Meanwhile, he has a simple task; either he could prove what he says or he cannot. I will not omit that the words of Daniel, although they sound this way in the Greek text, still in the Hebrew source are plainly contrary in the opinion of St. Jerome, who rendered the verse: “And he will be in lust for women.” And although the Hebrew words *re-kal ke-me-dat na-shis*, only mean reeling from lust for women, they also do not have any other words joined to them whereby it could be understood whether it will be or not be Antichrist that will lust after women. Still there are two conjectures which the version of St. Jerome makes more probable.

1) It is certain that Antiochus, whom Daniel is literally speaking about, was exceedingly addicted to the love of women: “Antiochus,” Jerome says, “is said to have been very lustful and so greatly disgraced the royal majesty through foul deeds and corruption, that he publicly had relations with mimes and harlots, and satisfied his lust in the presence of the people.”

[263](#) If this is so, how believable is it that Daniel was going to speak about such a king that will not be lustful for women?

2) Another conjecture is that since Antichrist is going to come as the Messiah of the Jews, and the Jews await a multitude of wives from the Messiah, apart from other goods, it is not in any way probable that Antichrist is going to command or praise celibacy.

Lastly, I add that if it is a mark of Antichrist that he will proclaim celibacy, then not only the Pope, but all the Fathers and even the Apostles themselves were Antichrists. For (that I might pass over the rest which will be advanced in its proper place) listen to what the Fathers of the II Council of Carthage say, in canon 2 of that council: “All are pleased that bishops, priests and deacons who confect the Sacraments ought to abstain from wives as guardians of chastity, that what the Apostles taught and antiquity itself preserved, we also would safeguard.” But let us continue.

“Sixth, Daniel says that he will worship the god Moazim, and with gold and silver, which he did, while he placed his whole piety in it, so that many wonderfully splendid temples were built and rested upon every kind of precious ornament and songs would resound.”

Many things were written above on the god Moazim, where we showed that he is either Antichrist himself or the devil whom Antichrist will secretly worship. But it seems to me that our Illyricus makes Jesus Christ the god Moazim, which is an intolerable blasphemy. For all the temples which the Roman Pontiffs have splendidly built and adorned with gold and silver are consecrated to Christ our God, and no man can be said to not know that. If, therefore, the one who is worshiped in temples of this kind is the god Moazim who does not see that Christ himself would be the god Moazim? Moreover, the building and adorning of temples did not begin in the year 666, the year our adversaries would have it that Antichrist appeared, but nearly three hundred years earlier.

Listen to Eusebius (from Ruffinus’ version): “From that fact joy was infused over us as if by a divine gift, especially at the sight of these places which a little before were destroyed by the treachery of the impious tyrants, that were now brought back to life with a more glorious construction, and high temples rose even higher for the humble assemblies.” [264](#) St. Cyril of Jerusalem also says: “These who are now kings built this holy Church of

the Resurrection, in which we are now, clothing it with silver and gold from their piety, and they made it splendid with silver monuments.” [265](#)

See, if you will, the magnificence of the temples of Christians and the splendor of the vessels of the Church in Eusebius’s *Life of Constantine*, [266](#) and Gregory of Nyssa; [267](#) Gregory Nazianzenus; [268](#) Chrysostom; [269](#) Cyril of Alexandria; [270](#) Damasus; [271](#) Ambrose; [272](#) Jerome; [273](#) Augustine; [274](#) Paulinus; [275](#) Prudentius in a hymn on St. Lawrence and Procopious in a book on the buildings of Justinian. Certainly, they all lived before the times of Antichrist, and still they witness that in each age their buildings were full of the ornaments of Christians, as we see these now, and they are beyond compare.

“Seventh, Daniel says that Antichrist will enrich his friends; the Pope has done that.”

Clearly he so enriched John of Eck, John Cochlaeus, John Fisher of Rochester, Latomus, Driedo, Tapper, Pedro de Soto and so many other learned men, who, although they labored for days and nights to refute the frenzies of our adversaries, still, they received not even a penny from the Roman Pontiff. Although they expected no reward from men, they labored chiefly for the glory of God. But if the Roman Pontiff allots priestly opulence to cardinals and bishops, it is not as much that he believes they must be enriched as the piety of the faithful, who donate wealth to this purpose.

Illyricus continues: “Paul places five marks of Antichrist in 2 Thessalonians 2. 1) That he will sit in the temple of God. The Pope does this. He, by styling himself vicar of Christ, reigns over the consciences of men. For if he were to profess that he is the enemy of Christ, as the Mohammadans, he would be outside the Church.”

But Paul does not only say Antichrist is going to sit in the temple of God (for every bishop sits in the temple of God), but he explains in what manner he is going to sit in the temple, showing himself *oti estin Theos*. The Pope, on the other hand, by Illyricus’ own testimony, makes himself the vicar of God, not God himself. A vicar of God cannot be God unless he would fabricate lesser gods as well as greater ones. Thereupon, I ask, if the Pope is not outside the Church, as he says in this passage, and hence is within the Church, where, I ask, is Illyricus with his own? Is he outside the Church?

For the Church is one, and the Pope sits in it. He who is not in it, is in no Church at all. But let us hear the rest.

“2) The fact that Paul says that now a great mystery is worked: I think it looks to the fact that the bishop of Rome, a little later, would begin to raise his head above that of others.”

Without a doubt, as we wrote briefly above, following Nicholas Sanders who had already seen and written this very thing, Illyricus would make St. Peter the Antichrist, but Christ to be Simon Magus or Nero to be Christ. For Paul did not say the mystery of iniquity will be worked a little later, but was being worked in his time. Why, if this mystery pertains to the Roman Pontiff, is it necessary to pertain to St. Peter and if St. Peter, (the mind shudders to think and the hand fears to write) was the Antichrist, who does not see that Simon Magus and Nero, the enemies of St. Peter, were Christ and God? Let Illyricus have Gods and Christs of this sort for himself; we will not envy him.

“3) What Paul says, that Antichrist is going to come with characteristic lies, which the Pope has done, as experience witnesses.

4) That God will permit the efficacy of illusion: this manifestly happens in the papacy. For by far we believed the Pope more strongly than God.”

We have already treated on the miracles of Antichrist above (chapter 15) and what Illyricus says is “from experience” is a very impudent lie. The Popes have never done either true or false miracles (not in this age nor in a previous one), whereby Antichrist is said to principally rule. What he adds on the efficacy of illusion, anyone should see how easily this has been twisted into an adverse meaning. What greater efficacy of illusion can be contrived than that in our time some are discovered who prefer to trust two or three apostates than the universal Church, all councils and all the Fathers, who apart from admirable doctrine and outstanding sanctity of life, are glorified with many miracles?

Moreover, what Illyricus advances in his fifth mark from St. Ambrose was refuted above in the second proof, in which we showed that Antichrist has not yet come.

Lastly, Illyricus adds a little from the epistle to Timothy: “In the last times many will leave the faith. [276](#) The Pope denies there is another faith apart from the historic one. They attend impostor spirits; the Pope proves all

things by visions of spirits and souls. They forbid marriage, the use of food each of these from the Pope is very true and well known.”

But, my good man, the Pope learned there is one faith from Paul; you seem to have learned from there something besides one faith; the Apostle says to the Ephesians: “One God, one faith, one Baptism.” [277](#) Paul never defined this one faith as a trust resting upon the promise and Word of God, as you define it. [278](#) But he said to the Romans: “This is the word of faith which we preach, because if you shall confess the Lord Jesus in your mouth and will believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved.” [279](#) He also said to the Hebrews: “By faith we believe the world was arranged by the Word of God.” [280](#)

Who does not know that it pertains to sacred history that Christ rose from the dead and the ages are suited to the Word of God? Still, we do not call the one, only and true faith with which we certainly believe whatever God deigned to reveal by the Apostles and prophets historic faith, but Catholic faith. For we leave novelties of names to our adversaries.

What he adds, that the Pope proves all things by visions of spirits and souls, I do not know what spirit revealed to him. For to confirm those things which pertain to the state of souls, we apply something from apparitions of souls and from the approved writings of ancient authors. Such is what Eusebius writes on the apparition of St. Potamina [281](#) and that which St. Augustine relates on the apparition of St. Felix Nolan. [282](#) On the other hand, I do not know who ever advanced visions of Catholic souls to prove dogmas. But that is not his first lie.

What he advances in the last place on the prohibition of foods and spouses is easily refuted by St. Augustine: “So, again, if you were to encourage virginity just as the apostolic doctrine does, ‘He who gives in marriage does well, and he who gives not in marriage does better;’ if you taught that marriage is good, and virginity better, as the Church teaches (which is truly Christ’s Church), the Holy Spirit would not have heralded you as forbidding marriage. What a man forbids he says is evil, but he does not do so when he places something better before a good.... You see, then, that there is a great difference between exhorting to virginity by proposing it as the better of two good things, and forbidding to marry by denouncing

the true purpose of marriage; between abstaining from food as a symbolic observance, or for the mortification of the body, and abstaining from food which God has created for the reason that God did not create it. In one case, we have the doctrine of the prophets and apostles; in the other, the doctrine of lying devils.” [283](#) It is not necessary to add anything.

Illyricus concludes: “Therefore, it is certain from these clear signs that the Pope is himself the true Antichrist, about whom the Scriptures prophecy.” But perhaps he would more suitably conclude in this way: Therefore it is certain from these clear lies, that Illyricus is one of his precursors, whom the holy prophet Daniel long ago foretold would have an impudent mouth.

CHAPTER XXII: The Ineptitude of Tilman Is Refuted.

TILMAN HESH wrote a book with the title *de Antichristo* that he subtitled “On six-hundred errors of the Popes” (which ought to be titled On six-hundred lies of the Lutherans). In it, he embraces four errors. Thus he says:

“The Popes say that Antichrist is going to come from Babylon from the tribe of Dan.” [284](#)

Thanks are in order for Tilman, who teaches this is of ancient and holy Popes. If they are Popes who say Antichrist is going to come from the tribe of Dan, then certainly the Popes are Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Ambrose, Augustine, Prosper, Theodoret, Gregory, Bede, Arethas, Rupert, Anselm and Richard: all these, as we showed above, [285](#) teach in a common consensus that Antichrist is going to be born from the tribe of Dan. Still, we continue with Tilman.

“Secondly, the Papists deny that the Roman Pontiff, with his fellowship, are the true Antichrist, although it is proved and shown by very strong and clear testimonies of the divine word.”

But we do not yet see these testimonies, nor are they extant in our Hebrew, Greek or Latin Bibles. For that which he advances as testimony for his side does not even name the Roman Pontiff.

“Thirdly, they teach Antichrist is only going to reign for three and a half years.”

Here, immortal thanks are due to Tilman, because he affirms that not only all the Fathers, but even the Prophet Daniel and John the Evangelist are Papists. And he thus duly spares me his and his own, by which he reserves merely the dregs of the Scriptures, having abolished all learned and approved Fathers to the Papists. Please see what we taught above (chapter 8) and one will find those who taught this with eloquent words, whom Tilman affirms are Papists for teaching it, namely Irenaeus, Hippolytus,

Cyrl, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, Primasius, Aretha, Bede, Anselm, Richard, Rupert and even Daniel and John.

“Fourthly, they teach Antichrist is going to be killed on Mt. Olivet.”

And here also he makes great men into Papists. Accordingly, Antichrist must be killed on Mt. Olivet, as St. Jerome gathers from Daniel and Isaiah.

[286](#) Theodoret also, writing in the same place, even if he does not name Mt. Olivet, he affirms Antichrist must be killed not far from Jerusalem. But we shall see by what arguments he refutes the aforesaid errors. For he immediately adds the antidote in these words:

“The papist trifles on Antichrist that rest upon no testimony of Sacred Scripture must be rejected and detested. Jerome rightly says that he who does not place authority in Scripture is condemned by the same levity whereby he asserts something. And Paul warns that we should beware of the traditions of men. [287](#) I say this, however, lest anyone would impose upon you with false reasoning, etc. Likewise: ‘See lest anyone would deceive you by philosophy, etc.’ It must be sought from the Word of God what is thought about Antichrist, such as in 1 John 2. ‘Who is a liar but he who denies Jesus is the Christ? This is the Antichrist.’ Likewise, 2 Thess. 2, ‘The man of sin and son of perdition will raise himself over every God, etc.’ Likewise Matth. 24, ‘Pseudochrists will arise, and Pseudoprophets, and they will give signs, etc.’ Daniel 11: ‘And he will make offering to the god Moazim,’ and in Apocal. 17: ‘And I saw a woman drunk on the blood of the saints and from the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.’ From these Sacred Scriptures, what the Christian faith holds about Antichrist, whom Christ and the Apostles foretold is coming, appears crystal clear in its testimonies. Since they are more clearly brought into the light, each individual mark agrees more clearly with the Roman Pontiff, so there should be no doubt that the Roman tyranny is the worst Antichrist.”

It will not be tiresome, I believe, if we recall these cruder arguments to a syllogism and thence conclude the confutation of the clear errors above. Therefore the first error is refuted. The trifles of Popes, because they rest upon no testimony of Scripture, must be rejected and detested. But the Word of God declares: “He who denies Jesus is the Christ, he is Antichrist.”

[288](#) Therefore, it is an error to say Antichrist is coming from the tribe of Dan.

The second error is thus confuted. As Jerome rightly says, whatever has no authority in Scripture is condemned by the same levity whereby it is asserted. But Paul says: “the man of sin, and son of perdition will raise himself over every God.” [289](#) Therefore the Papists err when they deny the Pope is the Antichrist.

Thus the third, and more powerfully because it is from two Scriptures; St. Paul says, “I say this, lest they place false reasonings upon you, etc.” [290](#) And there will rise “Pseudochrists and pseudoprophets, and they will give signs, etc.” [291](#) Therefore it is an intolerable error of the Popes when they say that Antichrist will rule for three and a half years.

The last and strongest of all because it is from three Scriptures. Paul warns: “See lest anyone deceive you with philosophy, etc.” [292](#) Antichrist will make an offering to the god Moazim, [293](#) and John saw a woman drunk on the blood of the saints. [294](#) Therefore, the Papists err by the whole heaven when they say Antichrist is going to be killed on Mount Olivet.

Candid reader, forgive me for treating Tilman so ridiculously. Yet the impudence of the man compels me, since he has nothing worthy by way of refutation; but after writing such nonsense he still boasts as if he offered proofs as certain and as clear as in Mathematics.

CHAPTER XXIII: The Lies of Chytraeus are Refuted.

DAVID CHYTRÆUS takes up in his commentary on the Apocalypse a vision of John where, as the fifth angel blows a trumpet, a vast star was seen to fall from heaven to earth, to which was given the key of the well of the abyss. After that a dense smoke was seen to rise from the abyss that darkened the sun and the air. Lastly, some strange locusts were seen to advance from the smoke; a little after they bore before themselves the appearance of horses, lions, scorpions and armored men. [295](#) Chytraeus explains that he thought this vision corresponded to the Roman Pontiff, and would also have it so thought by others when he says: “There is no doubt that this vision describes Antichrist, or the order of the Roman Papacy.”

He also teaches that this vision begins in the year 600, and that star falling from heaven was Gregory the Great, the Roman Pontiff; his successors are those who abandoned the keys of the kingdom of heaven and received the keys of the well of the abyss. The smoke advancing from the well is the corruptions of doctrine and various traditions of the Roman Pontiffs. Next, he would have it that the swarms of locusts are bishops, clergy, monks; and to dissipate that smoke he proposes that the antithesis of pontifical doctrine is the evangelical doctrine, which is Antichristian opposed to Christian, and embraces twelve articles, as if it were another Apostolic Creed.

But this opinion can easily be refuted. 1) It rests upon no witness. Amongst the Fathers who interpreted this verse, such as Arethas, Bede, Primasius, Anselm, Rupert and others on this place, the star which fell from heaven represents the devil, not some bishop. In Isaiah it is said about the Devil: “How did you fall from heaven, O Lucifer, who rose in the morning?” [296](#) And because the devil fell much earlier than John’s Apocalypse, the Fathers note that John did not say I saw a star falling from heaven, but “I saw the star that had fallen from heaven to the earth.” For John saw that star that already was on earth, which formerly had shined with the brightest light in heaven. It very suitably corresponds to the Devil,

just as what follows: “And the key of the well of the abyss was given to him.” As Christ has and shares the keys of the kingdom of heaven with his own and rules over the minds of the faithful and the pious, so the Devil has the key of the well of the abyss and rules over the sons of infidelity; he is everywhere called in the Scripture: “the prince of Darkness; the prince of this world; god of this age.” [297](#) He is also the one who, with God’s permission, sends out the smoke of errors from the well and new swarms of locusts, that is heresiarchs with their armies, in nearly every age against the boundaries of the Church.

2) The opinion of Chytraeus is opposed to what John says in this same chapter on the sixth angel, and the sixth persecution. St. John describes six persecutions of heretics through the trumpets of the six angels, which were going to come from the time of the Apostles even to the end of the world. And even Chytraeus is not far off in that he understands by the first trumpet the heresy of the Ebionites, which was roused in the time of the Apostles. For the second trumpet he understands the heresy of the Gnostics that came after it; for the third the heresy of Paul of Samosata and his followers as well as the Arians; the fourth heresy is of the Pelagians, who were later than all the previous heretics.

Moreover, if through the fifth trumpet the persecution of the Roman Antichrist is understood, which all agree is the last persecution, then what shall we understand by the sixth trumpet? Chytraeus responds that the sixth trumpet signifies the persecution of Muhammad and the Turks. But this is not said rightly, both because the Muslims are not heretics but pagans and because the persecution of Muhammad will not follow that of Antichrist but will precede it, just as we think, or it will take place at the same time, as Chytraeus says. Therefore, Chytraeus is compelled to confound the fifth trumpet with the sixth, when still he related the others to different times. Catholics understand the sixth trumpet better; it is the persecution of Antichrist which truly will be the last and most fierce; but through the fifth some exceedingly pernicious heresy which will nearly precede the times of Antichrist. Yea, many guess with great probability it will be the Lutheran heresy.

3) But Chytraeus errs by the whole heaven when he teaches that St. Gregory was the star falling to earth, since St. Gregory, if any trust can be placed in historians, did not fall from heaven to earth but ascended from earth to heaven. He went from a judge to a monk, from a monk he was

made a bishop; he never went back from the episcopacy to his magistracy, or from a monk back to the world. This is the same as what St. Basil, Gregory Nazianzen and John Chrysostom did amongst the Greeks, and Martin, Paulinus, and Augustine among the Latins, who went from seculars to monks, and were thereafter made bishops. No one ever said on that account that they fell from heaven to earth. Next, Gregory was second to none in regard to continence, sobriety and the love of heavenly things, but in humility he excelled all; and still Chytraeus would so boldly say that he fell from heaven, that is, from heavenly life to earth, nay more to an earthly life full of carnal delights.

Even Luther called Gregory a saint [298](#) and Luther followed Theodore Bibliander [299](#) in raising Gregory with the greatest praise; he said that the degree in which he excelled in zeal for piety and doctrine can be seen in his books, which is very true. For his writings breathe an admirable sanctity.

What he adds on the smoke from the well is no less vain. He interprets it as the corruption of doctrine introduced into the Church by Gregory and his successors. Yet, Gregory changed nothing which pertains to doctrine, instead what pertains to rites and discipline. He corrected many things which had crept in through abuse; he restored many things which had been forgotten by the negligence of time. Just so, he established a few new things, and those by mature counsel, as can be recognized both from the four books on his life, written by John the Deacon, and from his epistle where he explains the nature of the rites which he restored or instituted. [300](#) This matter will become especially clear if we review the very antithesis of evangelical and pontifical doctrine which Chytraeus proposes, not to mention by which he more often loses readers afterward.

I.

ON THE TRUE RECOGNITION AND INVOCATION OF GOD.

The Gospel teaches that only one God must be invoked and worshiped, just it is commanded to be done in his word. All trust in

our salvation must be placed in the goodness and mercy of God alone. The Popes command men to invoke not only the true God, but also dead men or saints, to seek aid and help in perils and to wait for it, etc. This is plainly from a heathen custom; they bind the invocation and worship of God to certain statues, and thence if they come to this or that statue with invocation, God will be more merciful than to others.

Because we treat copiously on these controversies, which are touched upon in this *Antithesis*, in different places, here we will only show briefly that doctrine that Chytraeus calls “pontifical” is neither opposed with the Word of God nor began in the time of St. Gregory.

The Word of God teaches that only one God must be worshiped and invoked with that invocation and adoration which is due to God alone (who is also a jealous God should we hold a creature for a creator). Nevertheless, the same Word of God commands us to honor more excellent creatures, even that we might invoke some, but not as gods, rather as beloved members of God’s family. Just the same, kings suffer if they would see royal honors conferred upon their servants, but they rejoice when they see the same servants honored and observed. David says, “Adore [301](#) the footstool of his feet.” [302](#) and Job says: “Call, if there is one to respond to you, then turn to one of the saints.” [303](#) For that reason Abdias, a great and holy man, adored Elijah prostrate on the ground. [304](#) And the sons of the prophets when they heard the spirit of Elijah had passed to Elisha, coming they “adored him prostrate.” [305](#) And the Apostle Paul implored the prayers of Christians for nearly all individuals, that through these he would be liberated from many dangers. No other reasoning can be given why it would decrease the honor due to God, if we were to demand from the souls of the saints to pray for us to God, just as it is not diminished if we will ask the same thing from the living.

Thereupon, St. Ambrose, who is 200 years earlier than St. Gregory, still so speaks in his book on widows: “The angels must be implored, who were given to guard us; the martyrs must be beseeched, of whom the pledge of

the body seems to us to claim patronage. We are not ashamed to employ them as intercessors in our infirmity.”

Moreover, we do not assign worship and invocation to statues of the saints, to memorials of the martyrs, and the remaining religious monuments any differently than God did to the sanctuary or to the temple of Solomon. Even if God hears us everywhere, and we can lift up our hands to God in every place, still, it is not without a reason that the Holy Spirit [306](#) and Christ call the temple of God the house of prayer. [307](#) Nor is it without reason that the most pious emperor Theodosius (as meanwhile I might pass over a great many examples from antiquity) encompassed every place of prayer with the Priests and the people; before the reliquaries of martyrs and the Apostles they laid down prostrate on a rug and begged their faithful assistance from the saint’s intercession. And certainly Theodosius who did this, and Ruffinus who wrote it [308](#) preceded St. Gregory by at least two hundred years.

II

ON THE OFFICE AND BENEFITS OF CHRIST

The Gospel teaches that eternal life and remission of sins be given on account of the unique and only Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified, died and resurrected for our sake, not for any work or merits of ours. And indeed, this honor is proper to God alone, as is said in Isaiah 43: “I am, I am he who blots out iniquities.” Likewise: “There is no salvation in any other.” The Popes teach the contrary, not on account of the merits of Christ alone, but partly on account of Christ, and partly on account of our contrition, obedience or good works, that we are justified and saved, etc.

Catholic doctrine does not hold that sinners will be justified partly by Christ and partly by their works, as if their works would merit anything without Christ. Accordingly, we distinguish three kinds of works. One type is done from the strength of nature alone without faith and the grace of God. Concerning these, we plainly declare with the Apostle that a man is not justified from works but from faith, and if someone would be justified from works of this sort he would have glory, but not before God, as St. Paul says

about Abraham. [309](#) Therefore, there is no controversy on these works, even if here and there it is attributed to us that we teach works are meritorious without the faith of Christ, which is an impudent lie.

The second type of works proceed from faith and the grace of God which disposes one to reconciliation with God and remission of sins. Of this kind are prayer, almsgiving, fasting, sorrow for sins and others. We do not say such works are meritorious from the justice of the reconciliation itself, but on the contrary we hear what was said at the Council of Trent, [310](#) that men are justified by grace because neither faith nor the works which precede justification merit it, but from justice, as if justification were due to works of this sort. Still, we affirm these works themselves, insofar as they proceed from faith and divine assistance, are divine works and merit in that manner, *i.e.* obtain remission of sins. Even if one would not concede it, nevertheless he concedes the Word of God. Why is it that Ezechiel says: “And when the evil man turns himself away from the wickedness that he has done and does judgment, and justice: he shall save his soul”? [311](#) Why does Daniel say, “Redeem your sins with almsgiving”? [312](#) Why does Jonah say: “God saw their works (fasting and hairshirts) and pitied them”? [313](#) Why does Christ say, “Much has been forgiven her because she has loved much”? [314](#)

Not only Gregory, but also many of the Fathers taught this very thing before him. Ambrose says, “Tears do not demand forgiveness, but they do merit it.” [315](#) St. Jerome, “Those who simply confess their sins merit mercy from the humility of the Savior.” [316](#) Augustine says: “Remission of sins itself is not without any merit if faith obtains this. For the merit of faith is not nothing; by such faith he said: ‘God be merciful to me, a sinner,’ and he went down justified, faithful and humble.” [317](#) And in another epistle: “If someone will have said that faith of a work merits grace we cannot deny, but freely confess that it is so.” [318](#)

The last kind of works is of those that make a man justified and proceed from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the heart of man as well as charity diffused in it. To such works, whether you like it or not, we attribute merit. Not in the manner that the remission of sins (which preceeds it) can

properly fall under merit, but they truly and properly merit glory and eternal beatitude. Otherwise, why would Paul say: “I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the true faith, as to the rest there is laid up for me a crown of justice that the just Judge will render to me on that day”? [319](#) If eternal life is not truly the wages of good works, why does he call it the crown of justice, and not the gift of mercy? Why does he say it must be rendered, not given? Why from the just judge, not from a generous king? Therefore, St. Augustine says: “Even eternal life itself, which at any rate will be enjoyed without end and consequently is given for merits that precede it, nevertheless, we are not sufficient in ourselves to furnish those very merits for which eternal life is given; rather we do these works by grace, it is even expressed by grace, but not because it is given by our merits, rather because the merits themselves are given, by which eternal life is given.” [320](#)

Those two Scriptural testimonies that Chytraeus quoted hardly strike fear in us, namely: “I am the one who blots out iniquities... There is no salvation in any other.” Testimonies of this sort exclude another God, another Christ, and another Savior and doctor of souls, which truly promise salvation without the true God and Christ Jesus the Savior. Nevertheless, they do not exclude faith, hope, charity, penance and the Sacraments, whereby the merit of Christ is applied to us, especially with God’s operation. Otherwise, how could these two propositions adhere together: “I am the one who blots out iniquities; There is no salvation in any other,” and “Your faith has saved you”; [321](#) “He will save those who hope in him”; [322](#) “He will save his soul”; [323](#) “The fear of the Lord expels sin”; [324](#) “He who will have believed and been baptized, will be saved”; [325](#) “He who eats this bread will live forever?” [326](#) That is sufficient on this point; let us continue with Chytraeus.

III

The Gospel teaches that one who does penance and hears the promise ought to believe the promise and determine that the sins of others,

such as Peter or Paul, and even his own are remitted on account of Christ. Such a man pleases God, is received and heard by God and by this faith he comes to God in daily invocation. The Popes contend that it always must be doubted whether we have remission of sins. Such a doubt is simply opposed to faith and is clearly heathen.

Our Gospel sufficiently teaches that it behooves one to have faith in the promises of God; all Catholics teach that there is no reason to doubt this. Still, there is no place in the Gospel where one can read that remission of sins is promised to men by God. Much less can one find that each and every man should determine for certain that his own sins are remitted or that he pleases God, is received by God or heard by him. Rightly so, because it would overturn the other passages in which one can very clearly read the contrary. For what could be more clear than what the wise man writes in Ecclesiastes: “There are the just and the wise, and their works are in the hand of God; still no man knows whether they are worthy of hatred or love.” [327](#) Likewise it is clear from Job chapter IX: “Even if I were simple, is my soul ignorant of this?” And again: “I feared all my works, knowing that you would not spare the offender.”?

What of the fact that nearly all divine promises have an attached condition, which no man can know for certain whether he will have fulfilled them or not? “If you wish to enter into life, keep the commandments.” [328](#) “If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father, and mother, and wife and children, brothers, sisters and still his own life, he cannot be my disciple.” [329](#) “The Spirit himself gives testimony to our spirit, that we are sons of God; but if sons, then heirs, heirs of God, co-heirs of Christ, still, if we suffer it is so we will be glorified with him.” [330](#) Next, St. Ambrose, who (as we said above) is much older than Gregory, says: “He wished the reproach that he suspected to be taken away from him, or else he thought in heart that God had not done so; although it was abolished by penance, still he suspected that his reproach still remained; and therefore he prayed to God that he would take it from him, because God alone knows what he cannot know even though he is the one who did it.” [331](#)

III

The Gospel teaches that there is only one propitiatory sacrifice in the world (Hebrews 7:10), that Christ was offered once and for all to take away sins. The Popes teach that Christ is offered daily in the sacrifice of the Mass to God the Father.”

Indeed the Gospel teaches that there is only one propitiatory sacrifice in the world because it was offered on the cross once and no Catholic denies that. Yet, the Gospel nowhere says that this unique sacrifice cannot daily be repeated in a mystery by Christ the High Priest through the hands of priests, and Catholics affirm this. Not only do they affirm it, those in all the centuries after Gregory, but so do all the Fathers that preceded him by many centuries. Let us take Augustine in the name of all the others, who said: “Was not Christ immolated once in himself? And still, in the Sacrament he is immolated for the people, not only through all the solemnities of Easter, but every day.” [332](#)

V

The Gospel teaches that sin is not only external actions opposed to the law of God, but even doubts about God, carnal security and contumacy, as well as the concupiscence born with us, and cast off in rebirth (Romans 7). The Popes deny that these evils are cast off in rebirth [Baptism] and claim these are sins opposed to the law of God.

No Popes, that is, Catholics, teach that only external actions are sins; rather this is a lie that Chytraeus learned from his father, who does not stand in the truth. Moreover, we do not question whether doubts about God, carnal security, contumacy and concupiscence are sins if they are voluntary; but if they are involuntary, such as the lusts of the flesh against the spirit, which Paul sensed, even if he did not share in them, these we steadfastly deny are sins. We do not relate this concerning the Pauline words to the heretics as if the words of Paul are true for them and not for us, but concerning the interpretation of the words. Chytraeus should not take it too badly if we propose Augustine and the whole chorus of the saints against these new men. Augustine says: “But concerning that concupiscence of the

flesh of which they speak, I think that they are deceived, or that they deceive; for with this even he that is baptized must struggle with a pious mind, however carefully he presses forward, and is led by the Spirit of God. But although this is called sin, it is certainly so called not because it is sin, but because it is made by sin, as a writing is said to be some one's hand because the hand has written it. [333](#)

VI

The Gospel teaches that man can by no means satisfy the law of God in this imbecilic nature and that the just man in the perfect fulfillment of the law has committed every sin. (Romans 8). The sense of the enmity of the flesh is against God, for he does not obey the law of God, and cannot even do so. The Popes contend that man can satisfy the law of God and be just in this perfect fulfillment and merit eternal life.

The Popes, *i.e.* sons of the Catholic Church, do not say that man in this imbecility of nature has committed every sin. We acknowledge and profess it is very true what John says in the beginning of his epistle: "If we will have said that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." Yet, these daily sins do not abolish justice, nor are against the law apart from the law of God, when for the remission of the same faults, "every spirit will pray in due season," [334](#) and all the just sons of God and saints daily are taught to say: "Forgive us our sins." [335](#) For that reason, we do not fear to assert that man can be justified by the grace of God, and fulfill the law by the assistance of the same grace and in that fulfillment merit eternal life. We know who said: "And his commandments are not heavy," [336](#) and likewise "Call the workers and pay them the wage." [337](#) And again: "Come ye blessed of my Father and possess the kingdom prepared for you, etc., for they hungered and you gave them to eat."

For this reason Augustine says: "For it is certain that we keep the commandments if we will; but because the will is prepared by the Lord, we must ask of Him for such a force of will as suffices to make us act by the

willing.” [338](#) And again: “Therefore, grace is given not because we fulfill the law, but that we can fulfill the law.” [339](#) Nor do the words of the Apostle trouble us: “The sense of the flesh is enmity opposed to God.” The same Apostle had already said: “Therefore, I myself serve the law of God in mind, while the flesh serves the law of sin.” [340](#) What we do in mind, we truly do, but what we do in the flesh, if it is opposed to the mind, it is not ours, just as the same Apostle says: “If I do what I refuse, I do not work it.”

VII

The Gospel teaches that good works are merely those that were commanded by God, according to the rule whereby he commands us only to those things ratified by the Lord, you shall not add nor take away. But the Popes ruin the whole Church with traditions, etc.

As if this had not been repeated by them and refuted a thousand times already. When he says this is contained in the Gospel that good works are only those which God commanded, it is false. Where, I ask, does God command virginity? Doesn't Paul say: “Moreover, concerning virgins I have no precept of the Lord.” [341](#) and still he says in the same place that it is good to remain a virgin, “Therefore, he who marries a virgin does well, but he who does not does better.”

And that rule does not help him much; the things that I command you, let only these be done for the Lord. Moreover, in that place God does not forbid something other than that we should break his precepts; rather we should keep them whole, just as he commanded them, not turning to the left or the right. Therefore, St. Augustine, distinguishing precepts from counsels, says: “For it cannot be said: You shall not marry, as it is said ‘you shall not commit adultery,’ or ‘you shall not kill;’ the latter are demanded, so they are offered. If the former is done, it is praised, but if the latter two should happen, they are condemned. In the latter the Lord commands us what is due, in the former if you will have overspent, he will render to you upon returning.” [342](#)

VIII

The Gospel teaches that each part of the Sacrament of the Lord's supper must be administered to all Christians, and expressly from the chalice (Drink from this, all of you.) But the Popes decreed and defined otherwise.

Still we do not see that passage of the Gospel where we are taught that each part of the Sacrament must be administered to all Christians. For the Lord does not say: "Drink from this, all Christians", but "drink from this, all of you." And Mark explained who "all of you" might be when he added: "And they all drank from it." Moreover, not all Christians drank, but all the Apostles, who then alone supped with the Lord.

IX

The Gospel teaches that true penance, or conversion to God, is a grave sorrow of heart for sins, and faith establishing that his sins were certainly remitted by Christ, etc. On the other hand, even though the Popes number contrition among the parts of penance, nevertheless they feign that this remission of sins is merited, and add auricular confession that was not commanded by God, and satisfaction or works due= in which they satisfy for the eternal punishments of sins, and this very thing they devise can be done for money. The whole doctrine is a blasphemy against the merit of the son of God, who alone satisfied for sins.

Here he proves nothing and advances no testimony of the Gospel. I see only inane words poured forth with an admixture of lies. For what he says on conversion and grave sorrow of heart he could omit. We truly require conversion and grave sorrow of heart among penitents, although he requires nothing else than I know not what terrors he has for contrition. What he adds on establishing faith for our sins to be remitted was refuted above. What he says about the Pope's contrition meriting remission of sins is a lie refuted above. When he says the Popes say that temporal satisfaction satisfies for eternal punishments it is equally a lie. For we do not think it satisfies for eternal punishments since we do not doubt it is remitted in

justification, rather, God demands men who come to the Sacrament after Baptism to do penance for them either here or in purgatory. St. Augustine says: “The penalty is prolonged beyond the fault, lest, if the penalty were to end with the fault it would be accounted small.” [343](#)

What he adds next about auricular confession not being commanded or that satisfaction is opposed to the merit of Christ is yet another case where he says it but does not prove it. Let him read, if he will, St. Cyprian [344](#) and he will discover the necessary confession of sin as well as satisfaction repeated in these very terms. Now, that money is paid out for satisfaction among Catholics (lest by chance here he might suspect some foul business) is nothing other than one kind of satisfaction, and it can be changed into a different kind by the judgment of the priest, such as fasting and almsgiving. Let us continue to the rest.

X

The Gospel teaches that one spouse is conceded to all men whether lay or priests, and it says eloquently that the prohibition of a spouse and of food is the doctrine of the devil. On the other hand the Popes forbid a spouse to a great part of men, priests and monks, and command them to abstain from certain foods on certain days.

Where, I ask, does the Gospel teach that a wife is conceded to those who have a vow of continence? Perhaps in Hebrews 13 where we read: “A spouse is honorable to all [men].” Moreover, if “in all” means absolutely every man, it will be honorable then for a father and daughter to marry, or mother and son, and brother and sister. Yet if Chytraeus does not like this, then he also should not like the idea that marriage would be honorable among a monk and a consecrated nun, or even with the rest of men to whom marriage is not lawful by vow. For the Apostle only means that we will honor marriage in all things when it is rightly and legitimately joined. Moreover it remains for Chytraeus to prove that those who make a vow of perpetual continence can duly and legitimately marry.

Listen to what Chrysostom wrote to a monk by the name of Theodore, who desired to marry or perhaps already had: “Honorable nuptials; but it is not now fitting for you to preserve the privilege of the married and although

you frequently call this very thing nuptials, still, I reckon that it is worse than adultery.” [345](#) Concerning that passage of the Apostle, 1 Timoth. 4: “Prohibiting to marry,” etc., see what we said above in chapter 21 near the end.

XI

The Gospel teaches that there is one true and solid foundation upon which the Church of God is built, clearly our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Corinth. 3; Acts 4). That passage of Matthew 16 is so interpreted by St. Augustine (upon this rock), saying: ‘You are Christ, the son of the living God; this is upon my very self, the son of the living God, I will build my Church; upon me I will build you, not me upon you. Yet the Popes cry out to the contrary that upon the rock of the Roman Church and the ordinary succession of Popes, the whole rest of the Church of the Christian world has been built.

But I believe he does not oppose Paul with himself, when he says: “We are built upon the foundation of Apostles and prophets.” [346](#) Nor does he oppose Paul’s assertion: “There is no foundation of the Church apart from Christ.” [347](#) John, in the Apocalypse, ch. 21, when he says: “Twelve Apostles are the foundation of the twelve churches.” For Paul speaks on the primary foundation in Corinthians, while he speaks in Ephesians (along with John in the Apocalypse) on the secondary foundations. Augustine speaks on the quality of the foundation in his *Narrations on the Psalms* against the position of the Donatists, where he says: “Count the priests, even from the See of Peter itself. That is the rock which the proud gates of hell do not conquer.” But much more was said about this above in book I, ch. 10.

XII

The Gospel teaches that no Apostle or bishop, or any minister of the Gospel, is superior to another, or has greater power and dominion in what pertains to ministry. Rather all ministers have equal power to teach the Gospel, administer Sacraments, bind criminals and absolve

those doing penance, as Scripture teaches the keys of the kingdom were consigned to all the Apostles equally. [348](#) On the other hand, the Roman Pontiff boasts that he has supreme power over all other bishops and the whole Church, and carries both the spiritual and political sword by divine law, etc.

Where does the Gospel teach that one bishop or minister does not have greater power than another? I still have not found it. The places that he cites clearly show the contrary. In Luke 22 the Lord exhorts them to humility and forbids them the rule of kings, and also tyranny to those who ought to be in charge of the Church; still among the Apostles one was greater than the rest, nay more, the Lord affirms himself to be the leader of the others. For he says: “He who is greater among you, let him be made the lesser, and he who is excellent (in Greek this is *ēgoumenos*, which means a general), let him be just as an attendant.” Moreover, the Apostle, where he says that he planted and Apollo watered, and again he laid the foundation just like an architect, and others built, [349](#) doesn’t he mean clearly enough that he is greater than Apollo and the rest of his helpers?

Hence, in John 20 it is said to all the Apostles “Behold, I send you and whoever’s sins you will have forgiven, etc.”; but in chapter 21 the Apostles and the rest of the faithful are subjected to St. Peter, as sheep to their pastor, since to Peter alone in the presence of the other Apostles did the Lord say: “Feed my sheep.” Next, even if in Matthew 18 all the Apostles are indicated with the words “whatever you will have bound, etc.,” still, when he said, “I will give you the keys of the kingdom, etc.” he said it to Peter alone, and without a doubt the Lord did not promise something to him singly unless he also meant to show something singular to him. But on this we have said much above in Book I, chapters 12-14.

Now, to his objection against the two swords in Boniface VIII’s teaching where he mocks the arguments of that Pontiff, it is best to respond with just one thing in this place. We will take everything from St. Bernard who was a holy man even in the estimation of Chytraeus, as well as the customary plea of Melanchthon and Calvin that we have heard more than once. See book 2 and 4 of *De Consideratione*, or if he would like, he could refer back to the

very matter when we dealt with it in the last book on the Pope, [350](#) and this will suffice for Chytraeus' teaching on Antichrist.

Now we must briefly show that this very vision of John squares better with Luther and Lutherans. In the first place that star which fell from heaven to earth can signify Luther. It is clear since he went from a monk to a secular, from celibate to married, from poor he was made rich, and from sober and modest living to sumptuous dinners and lunches. What else is this than to have fallen from a heavenly way of life to an earthly one?

Next, the smoke from the well of the abyss that follows the fall is clearly the blind and stupid who have no sense. In that before Luther defected from the Catholic Church, nearly the whole West was of the same faith and religion and in whatever direction a man might go, he would always find his brethren. All were then in the light. But after the fall of Luther such a smoke of errors, sects and schisms rose out that now even in the same province, nay more, in the same city or even house, one does not recognize another.

This smoke also obscured (as it says in the Apocalypse) the sun and air. By the sun we understand Christ, through the air the Scriptures, whereby we find, in a certain measure, our own as well as expose our adversaries. Indeed, Transylvania and its nearby regions are a witness of how vehemently this smoke has obscured, where they openly deny the divinity of Christ; Germany is also a witness, where Anabaptists openly and everywhere deny the humanity of Christ. Now truly there were once many heretics that attacked Christ in a similar fashion, but none more impudently than the heretics of this time. For not only do many of them deny that Christ is God, but they add he cannot be invoked nor can we do anything to know him. It is a horror to hear or read with what temerity the heretics of our age dispute the mysteries of Christ.

Again, it is incredible how vehemently this smoke has obscured the Scriptures. Now there are so many versions and commentaries extant that are opposed to one another that what was once clear now seems very obscure. What can be said more clearly than what Paul said, "I have no precept from the Lord on virgins, but I have counsel." [351](#) And yet all the heretics of our time constantly deny that there ever was a counsel of virginity and that Paul does not dare to counsel that one embrace virginity in this passage, but rather he simply wanted to discourage man. What can

be said more plainly than the word of the Lord, “This is my body”? And yet nothing in this time is more obscure. What shall I say about the Transylvanians? They so pervert their commentaries on the Gospel of John (which was almost certainly written against Cherintus and Ebionis who denied the divinity of Christ) that they especially try to show from it that Christ is not God.

Now let us come to the locusts which come from the smoke of the well. Chytraeus understands through locusts bishops, clergy and monks, but he gets it all wrong, for even before the times of Gregory there were bishops, clergy and monks in the Church; nevertheless these strange locusts had not yet arisen. All the things that John says about the locusts square very suitably with the Lutherans and the other heretics of our time. 1) Locusts always come in great numbers and usually fall in squadrons. “A locust does not have a king and all go out in squadrons.” [352](#) So the Lutherans do not properly have one head since they deny that there is a head of the whole Church. Just the same, they rose in a very brief period to be a vast multitude and no wonder, for they open the door to all vice-filled men; the gluttons run to them, because the Lutherans establish no fasts; the incontinent likewise because they reject all vows of continence. They concede marriage to monks and priests—even consecrated nuns. Likewise all apostates flock to them because all the cloisters are reserved for them and converted into palaces. Greedy and ambitious princes, because they add Ecclesiastical goods to their person and even Ecclesiastical power, they become not only lazy but enemies of good works because among them faith alone suffices; good works are not necessary. Next, all the reprobate and criminals flock to them because they have lifted them from the necessity to confess their sins and give an account to their own pastor, which is usually a bridle to sinners. Hence the locusts have so multiplied.

Moreover, these locusts are described by St. John in a paradoxical fashion. For they are said to have a human face, and even that of a woman, the tail of a scorpion, the body of a locust, likewise they wear a crown on their head seeming to be of gold, but they have the teeth of lions and their chest is armed with an iron cuirass. Next, they seem just as horses prepared to battle and once they hear that the alarm has been sounded as the sound of chariots running to war, they had over themselves the king, the angel of the abyss, who is called the exterminator.

The charming faces mean the beginning of their preaching since it always begins from the Gospel. They promise to say nothing but the purest Word of God. This is how they so easily attract the more simple. The tail of the scorpion means a poisonous and deadly outlet, for after they proposed the Word of God they foul it up with perverse interpretation, just as a recoiled tail drives in the sting and the lethal venom is found. The body of the locust is almost nothing other than the stomach (for it is a large-bellied insect) and therefore it can neither advance nor fly correctly, but raises itself high by jumping and soon falls to earth. This means the heretics of this time are men addicted to their stomach, enemies of fasting and continence, and therefore can neither advance to the way of the commandments nor fly to contemplate heavenly things.

Certainly they try to raise themselves at some point and amend their morals, but after the fashion of locusts, soon they fall back to earth. The Saxon visitation can serve as an example. Luther noticed that on account of the “gospel liberty” that they had preached all laws of the Church were abrogated and the people, deprived of that bridle, rushed into sin. Therefore, he established the visitation and advised pastors to preach penance, fear of God, obedience and good works. Still, this accomplished nothing. [353](#)

For equal reason they try to fly through contemplation and already have written everywhere books on the Trinity, on the Incarnation, and on other mysteries of this sort; but they fall into very serious errors, nay more, pernicious heresies, which is clear from the Ubiquists, who destroy the whole mystery of the Incarnation and the Trinity. [354](#)

The crowns on the head of the locusts mean the arrogance and pride by which they raise themselves over all men. There is a book of Luther extant which was written to Duke George, in which he says, “No doctor or writer from the time of the Apostles, nor even any theologian or canon lawyer has confirmed, instructed and consoled the consciences of those in the lay state as remarkably and beautifully *as I have*. Through a singular grace of God I know this for certain, because neither Ambrose nor Augustine, who are the best in this matter, are equal to me in this.” What? Not only do Luther and Calvin make nothing of a thousand Cyprians and a thousand Augustines, but each Lutheran clergyman also holds Papists for asses and whipping posts! Were these the crowns that are just as gold—that is they seemed like gold but were not? They feign themselves full of zeal for the honor of God

and moved by charity to say the things they say, when still they are less than acquainted with the zeal of God.

The teeth of the lion mean the detractions with which they assiduously slander the repute of Pope, clergy and monks by letters and sermons, as well as the saints themselves who rule in beatitude with God. And they seem to be nurtured by detractions since they make so many which are not, nor have been and perhaps never, that they appear to be utterly devoid of conscience. It is clear enough both from the other things which are read everywhere in their books and from those which a little before we cited in the Smalchaldich council, in Illyricus, Tilman, Calvin and Chytraeus.

The chest armed with an iron breastplate means obstinacy. Our adversaries are so obdurate that even if they were clearly beaten in argument, they will still never yield. Often they prefer to die than to recede from their obstinacy.

The similitude of the horses who seem prepared for war means boldness and temerity. They boldly challenge all to war, even though afterward they only advance a great many lies for argument. Luther said: "Come here all you papists, put together all of your studies and untie this knot if you can."

[355](#) Nearly all the others speak in the same way. But the similitude of the swift chariots means the speed whereby that new heresy uses those possessed of different regions. In short order they occupied not only many kingdoms in the North, but even dared to sally to India, although God did not permit them establish themselves there, since the new and tender parts of the Church of Christ have not yet merited such a scourge.

Next, the angel of the abyss is called the king of these locusts, because even if locusts do not have a visible king, as we noted above, nevertheless, they have an invisible one since they cannot lack the devil as, "He is the king of all the sons of pride." [356](#) Moreover, the king of the locusts is called the exterminator because the devil never exterminated and devastated the Church through heresy as much as through Lutherans. For a great many of the other heresies destroyed one or another point of faith, but did not overturn all order and discipline in the Church. But the Lutheran heresy partly by itself, and partly by its daughters, Anabaptism, Calvinism, Trinitarianism and Libertinism, have altogether destroyed all goods of the Church in those areas where they prowl. They removed the Trinity from God through the new Samosatens, who also removed divinity from Christ;

through the Anabaptists the whole cult and invocation from the angels and saints, the suffrage of the living in purgatory; nay more, they clearly dismissed purgatory itself. From the Church on earth, they removed books of the divine Scripture, nearly all the Sacraments, all traditions, priesthood, sacrifice, vows, fasting, feast days, churches, altars, reliquaries, crosses, images, all monuments of piety and likewise Ecclesiastical laws, discipline, and they have also overturned all order.

Only hell remains, but perhaps it spared that lest it would do any injury to its king, the angel of the abyss. Not even this is the case, for many Lutherans deny that hell is a true place and fabricate I know not what sort of imaginary hell, but we spoke of this in Christ's descent into hell in another place. [357](#) Therefore, truly this can be called the exterminating heresy and a worthy title, which in Hebrew is *Abaddon*, in Greek is *apolluōn*, and in Latin *exterminans*. It should be no wonder if not even the Lutherans themselves marvel at this utter destruction except that, as we have said, they have been blinded by the smoke.

Still, there is one consolation amidst so many evils, that (as John says) these locusts do not harm the grass and the green trees; but only men who do not have the sign of the living God. Although that heresy may be wholly carnal, it cannot easily deceive good men in the souls of whom religion and piety have taken root and flourished. So we see rarely, or it has never happened, that some Church defected from the Lutherans that had not already begun to be corrupted among the lives of Catholics. But that is enough on this business.

CHAPTER XXIV: the Arguments of Calvin and Illyricus Are Refuted, Where the Former Tries to Show the Pope Is No Longer a Bishop, and the Latter on the Fable of “Pope Joan”.

IT only remains that we prove what we had proposed as the last place, that the Roman Pontiff is not only not Antichrist, but that he has not lost his pontificate in any way. Calvin attempts to show by means of a certain conjecture that today he is not a true bishop, saying: “I should like to know what quality of a bishop the Pope himself might have? 1) The office of a bishop is to instruct the people in the Word of God; 2) The next is to administer the Sacraments 3) admonish and exhort, to correct those who are in fault and restrain the people by whole discipline. Now, which of these things does he do? Nay more, which of these things does he pretend to do? Let them say then, on what ground they will have him to be regarded as a bishop when he does not even resemble any part of the duty with his smallest finger.

“It is not with a bishop as with a king. The latter, if he were not to execute the proper duty of a king, nevertheless, he retains the title and the honor. Yet, in judgment about a bishop, the command of Christ is regarded, which ought to always avail in the Church. Let the Papists then untie this knot. I deny that their pontiff is the prince of bishops, seeing that he is no bishop.”

Unless I am mistaken, the whole argument can be reduced to a syllogism. Since there is this difference between a bishop and a king, that the king is the name of a power and a prefecture to which is connected the duty of ruling the people, whereas the bishop is the name only of an office to minister the Word of God and the Sacraments; certainly then, if neither king nor bishop exercise their office then the name of king retains its

dignity while the name of bishop loses it. Moreover, the Roman Pontiff does not even exercise the episcopal office in any clear manner, seeing that he does not preach the Word of God to the people or administer the Sacraments; therefore the Roman Pontiff has lost the name and dignity and thus cannot be called a bishop.

Moreover, the Centuriators attempt to confirm this conjecture of Calvin's with a sign. They say that the evident sign of the change of the Roman Church into the whore of Babylon was something God willed near those times in which this change took place, that a certain woman who was a harlot would sit in the Papal seat, who was called Pope John VIII.

They attempt to show this, 1) from the authors Platina, Martin Polonus, Sigebert and Marianus Scotus; 2) from the vestiges of the affair which still remain in our time. Without a doubt there is a certain seat made of porphyry that is perforated on the inside, which remains in the palace of St. John Lateran that they say was established for use after the scandal was detected so that it would be discovered whether one recently created Pope was a man or not. Likewise, from a certain statue of a woman with a boy that remained even to our own times in that place, where it says the woman John VIII gave birth. Next, from the fact that the Roman Pontiffs, when they go from the Vatican to the Lateran, usually turn their head away at the place where this woman is said to have given birth in detestation of the fact; otherwise that is a straight road. It is not difficult, however, to untie these knots.

First we shall respond to Calvin. He is either talking about the signification of the name, or about the thing itself, when he says that *bishop* is the name of an office, but *king* is the name of a dignity. If the former, then he is clearly deceived, since a bishop is called from the Greek *episkopein* (to consider or inspect), and it means the duty of overseeing. In the same way a king (*rex*) is called from ruling (*regendo*) and means the office of ruling. Just as king is the name of a magistrate, so also is *episkopos* among the pagans, for whom the name meant a magistrate, that is a *praetor*. [358](#) What is more, the Holy Scripture attributes to a bishop the name of shepherd and king. [359](#)

But if Calvin speaks on the matter itself, then he is no less deceived. Just as royal authority is not a simple office to judge, as a judge of others, but is a true prefecture in political matters (the power to rule men subjected to him by commands and punishments); so also the episcopate is not a simple

office to preach, as it is for others who preach yet are not pastors, but is a true ecclesiastical prefecture that has the power to rule men in spiritual and divine matters—hence to command and punish. We have spoken about that matter and many others above, and we will have much to say elsewhere. For the moment, a few passages will suffice to make the matter crystal clear. The Apostle Paul teaches: “As for the rest, when I come I will distribute it.” [360](#) “Therefore, I write these things being absent because being present I will deal much more severely, according to the power that the Lord has given me.” [361](#) And in Hebrews he says: “Obey those who have been placed over you and be subject to them.” [362](#) Again, in 1 Timothy he says: “Do not receive an accusation against a priest unless it is with two or three witnesses.” [363](#) Besides, it is also false that Popes do not exercise episcopal office. For they are not held to give sermons and minister the Sacraments *per se*, if they are impeded by some just cause; rather it is sufficient if they will see to it that these things are done by others. Otherwise bishops would be obliged to do the impossible, since there is no place so scanty that a bishop can suffice by himself to preach and minister the Sacraments through the whole diocese. Therefore, just as it satisfies if he will preach through another in some place where he cannot be present, so also it satisfies if he will preach in every place through others when there is no way he could be present there. We do not lack the examples of antiquity. Possidius writes that St. Valerius, the bishop of Hippo, commissioned St. Augustine in the duty of preaching when he was still a priest, because being a Greek he could not preach to the people in Latin. [364](#) Possidius also relates that in the Eastern Church a great many bishops customarily demanded from their priests that they take up the office of preaching which they could not carry out by themselves. Nevertheless we cannot say that either S. Valerian or others who did not preach the Word of God themselves were not bishops.

Now what the Centuriators say, 1) That Sigebert, Marianus Scotus are more ancient than Martin Polonus, and, they place a “Pope Joan” [365](#) in their *Chronicles* is altogether false. Even if this is discovered in the printed versions of Sigebert and Marianus Scotus, it is not discovered in the most ancient manuscripts, it is certain that these authors’ testimonies are

corrupted. The most ancient example of Sigebert's manuscript is still extant from the monastery of Gembloux where he was a monk. It is reckoned to be in Sigebert's own hand and he makes no mention of a "Pope Joan." John Molanus, a Doctor of Louvain that is still alive, is a witness to the example of this manuscript. Likewise, in the most ancient copies of Marianus Scotus a "Pope Joan" cannot be found. The edition of the *Metropoli* of Albert Kranz published in 1524 at Cologne witnesses the fact.

2) Next, it is proved from his own narration that Martin Polonus fabricated this particular tale about "Pope Joan." a) He says this Joan was English from Moguntia. But Moguntia is not in England but in Germany. The Centuriators tell it the other way around, that she was Moguntian but raised in England. Moreover, Theodore Bibliander says in his *Chronicle* that she was not from England at all but merely educated there.

b) Martin and those who follow him says that she devoted herself to letters in Athens. But it is certain in that time there was no academy of letters in Athens or anywhere else in Greece. Synesius writes in his last epistle to his brother that in his time Athens was nothing, but he lived just after the times of St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzen. Cedrenus and Zonaras write in the lives of the emperors Michael and Theodora, around the end of the reign of Michael when he ruled by himself after he banished his mother Theodora, that schools of philosophy and good letters were restored by Bardas Cesar, when even to that time all studies of wisdom had been extinguished in Greece for a great many years, so much so that not even a vestige remained. It is certain that the reign of Michael by himself fell in the times of Pope Nicholas I who succeeded Benedict III, who succeeded this pretended Joan, that is the woman John VIII which they allege. Furthermore, all histories, even that of Bibliander, place the beginning of the reign of Michael alone in the year 856, while the pontificate of this Joan would have been 854. It follows then that after the death of this Joan education was beginning to revive in Greece.

c) The Centuriators say that this Pope Joan gave birth on a journey from the Vatican to inspect the Church of the Lateran. But it is a certain fact, as Onuphrius proves in a book on the seven churches, that the Roman Pontiffs did not live in the Vatican, but in the Lateran palace even to the times of Benedict IX, that is even to 1390. How, therefore, if she lived in the Lateran, would she want to go from the Vatican to inspect the Lateran? Certainly if anyone were to write today that the Pope went from the Lateran

to inspect the Church of the Vatican, it would be ridiculous, since everyone knows the Pope lives in the Vatican.

d) Martin and the others who follow him say this Joan gave birth during a solemn and public service. But this has no probability because a woman that was so many months with child would in no wise wish to proceed since there was a greatest danger of being detected.

3) This same thing is proven from an epistle of Leo IX, a very serious Pope, to Michael the bishop of Constantinople, where Pope Leo writes that the constant report is in the patriarchate of Constantinople that many eunuchs sat and among these a woman had crept in and was patriarch. [366](#) Leo IX certainly would never have mentioned this to the Greeks if such a thing had happened in the Roman See. Nay more, this is perhaps the root of the fable about Pope Joan. Since there was a rumor that some woman was the bishop of Constantinople, and then little by little, the name of Constantinople was dropped but the opinion and report of a female pontiff remained, and a universal Pontiff at that, some began to say in hatred of the Roman Church that the woman was the Roman Pontiff. And it has the appearance of truth that this rumor arose in the times of Martin. Certainly Martin Polonus, who first wrote this, relates no author but only says it is related. Therefore he has this only from an uncertain rumor.

Nor should it be any wonder if someone would fabricate this fable in hatred of the Roman Church, after the foundation about a female Pontiff had been laid amid the greatest contentions that existed in that time between emperors and Popes. For even now we see that the Centuriators fabricate more incredible things. Martin only wrote that this woman was English from Moguntia, and added nothing about her parents, or even the woman's proper name. Nevertheless, the Centuriators have felt free to add in the rest of the details, saying that her father was an English priest and that at first she was called Gilberta, and raised in the habit of a man in the monastery of Fuldensis, and that she wrote many books on sorcery. These are all merely fabrications without any witness and devised without reason. Add that Martin Polonus appears to have been very simple, since he wrote many other fables as if they were attested history.

Now what they say about the perforated seat, the statute of the woman and the turning aside on the road are easily answered. It is certain from the book of sacred ceremonies that there were three stone seats in the Lateran

Basilica in which a new Pope sat in the time of his coronation. [367](#) The first seat was before the entrance to the Church and this was low and abject; to such a seat a new Pope was lead and sat somewhat, to show by that ceremony that he ascends from the lowest place to the highest. From there elevating him they sung what we read in 1 Kings 2: “*Suscitat de pulvere egenum, et de stercore erigit pauperem, ut sedeat cum principibus et solium glorie teneat.*” [368](#) And this is the reason why these were called the seats of the dung hill. The second seat was made of porphyry in the palace itself, and there he sat a second time in the sign of possession, and also sitting there he received the keys of the Church in the Lateran Palace. The third seat was similar to the second and not far from it, and also sitting it in after a short time, he handed the same keys to the one from whom he had received them, perhaps that this ceremony would remind him of death through which in a short time he was going to hand that power to another. From that seat, to the discovery of his actual sex, there is never a mention.

But the statue of the woman with the child without a doubt was not Pope Joan. For if our adversaries say that ancient historians refused to place the memory of this event in their books, how does it have the appearance of truth that the Popes themselves would have wanted to remember it with a statue? Next, if the statue was of “Joan,” it would represent a woman with a little infant just born, but the image relates neither a woman, nor an infant she was bearing in her bosom, but a boy sufficiently large and several years old as if going before a servant. For that reason some men think it was a statue of some heathen priest prepared to sacrifice which his minister went before. Next, why the Popes omit the shorter way when setting out for the Lateran is not in detestation of any scandal but because that way is narrow and bent and it is usually very busy. Add that, as Onuphrius witnesses, there are plenty of Popes that have never once traveled on this road.

**BOOK IV: ON THE SUPREME
SPIRITUAL POWER OF THE POPE**

CHAPTER I: Whether the Pope Is the Supreme Judge in Controversies of Faith and Morals.

HITHERTO, in spite of the lack of our own genius, we have proven that: 1) the bishop of Rome was constituted by Christ as the supreme pastor of the whole Catholic Church; 2) he has never degenerated into Antichrist; 3) he has not lost this supreme dignity in any other way. Now we must treat on his power both spiritually and temporally. In the present book we shall treat on the spiritual power; the following and last book will be on the temporal power, with the help of God.

Although many things in particular could be discussed on the spiritual power of the Pontiff, still there are four principal questions:

1) On the power of judging controversies of faith and morals; that is, whether this power is placed in the Supreme Pontiff.

2) On the certitude or, we might say, on the infallibility of this judgment, namely, whether the Supreme Pontiff could err in controversies of faith and morals.

3) On the coercive power of imposing laws, that is, whether the Supreme Pontiff not only judges and does not err in his judgment, but also whether he can impose laws that oblige men in conscience and compel them to believe and act according to how the Supreme Pontiff has judged.

4) On the communication of this power, or whether jurisdiction over all other ecclesiastical prelates was communicated to the Supreme Pontiff by them, or whether it was received immediately from God.

Besides these general questions theologians usually treat particular ones, such as whether the Supreme Pontiff can call, transfer, or dissolve general councils, whether he can confer indulgences; whether he can canonize saints; whether he can approve or condemn religious societies and whether he can choose or at least confirm bishops. All of these questions, however, and others of this sort are not proper to this place. The first group pertains to the disputation on councils, the second group to the disputation on Penance; the third to the disputation on the cult of the saints, the fourth to the

disputation on vows and institutes of monks; the fifth to the disputation on the clergy. There, God willing, we will treat those questions.

We now take up the first general question on judgment of controversies, and we will spend a great deal of time on this point. For we already showed in the disputation on the Word of God that Scripture is not a judge of controversies, neither are secular princes or private men, whether approved or learned; rather ecclesiastical prelates. Now, in the disputation on councils it will be proven that councils indeed give judgment on controversies of religion (both general and particular) and that judgment is both firm and ratified, but only when the confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff comes. Hence, the Supreme Pontiff has the last judgment.

Therefore, in this disputation on the Pope we show the Supreme Pontiff is head and pastor of the whole Church. For what else do we show than that he is the supreme judge in the Church? There is either no one who ought to be a judge among men, or there ought to be one who is in charge of the rest. Nor do I think this ever could be recalled to controversy.

In the following this very question will become plain. For if we could show that the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff is certain and infallible then certainly it will establish that the same Pontiff is also the supreme judge of the Church. To what end would God have attributed infallibility in judgment to the Apostolic See except that he attributed supreme power in judgment to the same See? Lest we might say nothing on this point, let us advance a few testimonies from the law, the Gospel and the Fathers. In Deuteronomy there is a very conspicuous testimony wherein doubts that arose on religion were referred to the judgment of the high priest. Moses says: "If you will have observed a difficult and ambiguous judgment between subject and subject, leper and leper, and you will see words of the judges differ within your gates; then rise and ascend to the place which the Lord your God will have chosen, and you will come to the priest of the tribe of Levi, and you will seek the judge who will be present in that time from them, who will judge the truth of your case, and you will do whatever those who are in charge of the place will have said, whom the Lord chose." [369](#) In that passage we must observe that two persons are distinguished: the priest and the judge, *i.e.*, the pontiff and the prince. The pronouncement of the sentence by the priest demands execution by the judge. Deuteronomy explains it this way: "Whoever will have been proud, refusing to obey the

command of the priest, who in that time ministers to the Lord your God, will die by the judgment of the judge.” [370](#)

In the Gospel, nothing is said more clearly than what the Lord says to Peter in the presence of the other Apostles: “Simon, son of John, feed my sheep.” There we see two things: a) he speaks to Peter specifically, b) so much so that he does not exclude even the Apostles when he gives his sheep to him to be fed. Moreover, there cannot be any doubt whether it is among the duties of a pastor to discern the good pasture from the bad.

For this reason St. Jerome, a most learned man, in the question on the three hypostases did not trust his own erudition, nor the opinion of the Eastern bishops, nor even in the authority of his own bishop, Paul, the Patriarch of Antioch. Rather he wrote to Pope Damasus, saying: “I, a sheep, demand assistance from the pastor. Please, discern, for I will not fear to say three hypostases if you bid it so.” [371](#)

Theodoret, who was also very learned among the Greek Fathers, wrote to Pope Leo I, saying “If Paul, the herald of truth, the trumpet of the Holy Spirit, hastened to the great Peter to carry from him the solution to the difficulties of those at Antioch who hesitated from conformity with the law, much more do we, men insignificant and small, hasten to your Apostolic See in order to receive from you a cure for the wounds of the churches.”

[372](#)

Prosper of Aquitaine says in his *Chronicle* for the year 420: “In a council held at Carthage consisting of 216 bishops, the synodal decrees were advanced to Pope Zozimus; after they were approved, the Pelagian heresy was condemned throughout the world.” Thus, the whole world recognizes a final judgment only from the Roman Pontiff. St. Gregory, whom everyone judges to have been very humble and never took something to himself unless it were just, spoke thus in an epistle to all the bishops of France: “If on the other hand (God forbid that his providence should allow it to come about), some contention or business would emerge where perhaps the force of it would cause something to come into doubt, and due to its magnitude it would require a judgment of the Apostolic See, then, after the truth has been more diligently examined, let all labor be spent from that relation to our examination, insofar as a suitable judgment from us will end the matter beyond any doubt.” [373](#) The fact is that these holy Popes asserted the

same thing before and after Gregory; yet we never read that anyone
condemned this. [374](#)

CHAPTER II: A Question Is Proposed: Whether a Judgment of the Pope Is Certain?

NOW we come to the second question, but first it must be known at the outset that the Pope can be considered in four ways. 1) As a particular person or a private teacher; 2) As Pope, but by himself; 3) As Pope, but joined to a customary body of counselors; 4. As Pope together with a General Council.

Secondly, it must be observed that when it is asked whether the Pope could err, two things can be asked in all four of the ways that we have already considered. 1) Whether he could be a heretic. 2) Whether he could teach heresy. Then, it ought to be noted that 3) while on the one hand the judgments and decrees of the Pontiffs treat on all matters which are proposed for the whole Church, such as those decrees on faith and general precepts of morals; on the other there are particular matters that pertain to a few, such as nearly all controversies of fact; whether so and so should be promoted to the episcopate, or whether it was done lawfully, or whether he must be deposed.

With these things being noted, all Catholics and the heretics agree on two things. Firstly, that the Pontiff, even as Pontiff, can err in particular controversies of fact, even together with a general Council, because these depend especially on the testimonies of men. Secondly, the Pope can err as a private teacher from ignorance, even in universal questions of law concerning both faith and morals, just as what happens to other teachers.

Next, all Catholics agree on two other things, but only amongst themselves and not with the heretics. Firstly, the Pope with a general council cannot err when he issues decrees of faith or general precepts of morals. Secondly, the Pope, by himself or with a particular council, while stating something in a doubtful matter, whether he could err or not, must be obediently heard by all the faithful.

With such things being laid out, only four different opinions remain.

1) Should the Pope define something, even as Pope, and even with a general Council, it can be heretical in itself, and he can teach others heresy and that this in fact has happened thus. This is the opinion of all the heretics of this time, and especially of Luther, who in his book on councils recorded the errors even of general councils that the Pope approved. It is also the opinion of Calvin, [375](#) who asserted that at some time the Pope with the whole college of Cardinals manifestly taught heresy on that question of whether the soul of man is extinguished with the body, which is a manifest lie, as we will show a little later. Next, he teaches in the same book [376](#) that the Pope can err even with a general council.

2) The second opinion is that the Pope even as Pope can be a heretic and teach heresy, if he defines something without a general Council, something that this opinion holds did in fact happen. Nilos Cabásilas has followed this opinion in his book against the primacy of the Pope; a few others follow the same opinion, especially amongst the Parisian theologians such as John Gerson, Almain [377](#) and still, Alonso de Castro [378](#) as well as Pope Adrian VI in his question on Confirmation; all of these constitute infallibility of judgment on matters of faith not with the Pope, but with the Church or a General Council.

3) The Third opinion is on another extreme, that the Pope cannot in any way be a heretic nor publicly teach heresy, even if he alone should define some matter, as Albert Pighius says. [379](#)

4) The fourth opinion is that in a certain measure, whether the Pope can be a heretic or not, he cannot define a heretical proposition that must be believed by the whole Church in any way. This is a very common opinion of nearly all Catholics. [380](#)

These authors seem in some way to disagree with themselves because some of them say the Pontiff cannot err if he should proceed maturely and listen to the counsel of other pastors, while others say the Pope can err in no way whatsoever, even by himself; but really they do not disagree among themselves. For the latter would not deny whether the Pope should be held to proceed maturely and consult learned men; rather, they only wished to say that infallibility itself is not in a body of counselors or in a council of bishops, but in the Pope alone. On the other hand, the former would not have it that they place infallibility in the counselors, but only in the Pontiff;

rather they wished to explain that the Pope ought to do what is in himself by consulting learned men and experts in the matter which is treated. If anyone would ask, however, whether the Pope could err if he should rashly define something, then without a doubt the aforesaid authors would all respond that it cannot happen that the Pope would rashly define something, for God has promised the end, and without a doubt he promised also the means which are necessary to obtain that end. It would be of little benefit to know that the Pope was not going to err when he rashly defined something unless we also knew that the providence of God would not permit him to define something rashly.

From these four opinions, the first is heretical; the second is not properly heretical, for we see that some who follow this opinion are tolerated by the Church, even though it seems altogether erroneous and proximate to heresy. The third is probable, though it is still not certain. The fourth is very certain and must be asserted, and we will state a few propositions so that it can be understood and confirmed more easily.

CHAPTER III: The First Proposition is Established, On the Infallible Judgment of the Supreme Pontiff.

HEREFORE we come to the first proposition. *The Supreme Pontiff*
T*can in no case err when he teaches the whole Church in those matters which pertain to faith.* This is against the first and second opinion we laid down in the last chapter, and in favor of the fourth. It is also proved by the promise of the Lord in Luke 22, as we find it in the Greek: “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has asked for you that he might sift you like wheat, yet I have prayed for thee that thy faith would not fail, and that, thou later being converted, confirm thy brethren.” This passage is usually explained in three ways.

1) The first exposition is of the Parisian theologians, that the Lord here prayed for the universal Church, or even for Peter who stood as a figure of the whole Church, and prayed that the faith of the Catholic Church would never fail. Such an exposition would be true, were it to be understood that he [Christ] prayed for the head of the Church and consequently for the whole body, which is represented by the head; but that is not how they understand it. They would have it that the prayer was only for the Church.

This exposition is false. Firstly, because the Lord designated only one person, saying twice “Simon,” and adding, as often, the second person pronoun, “for thee,” “thy faith,” and “thou,” “thy brethren.” To what end would he do this? So that we would understand that Christ asked something special for Peter. Secondly, because the Lord began to speak in the plural: “Satan has asked that he might sift *you*,” but soon after changes his manner of speaking and said: “But I have prayed for *thee*.” Why did he not say for *you* as he had begun? Certainly if he were to speak on the whole Church, it would have been much more correct to say “for you.” [381](#) Thirdly, the Lord prayed for the one to whom he said: “And later, being converted,” but this certainly cannot agree to the whole Church unless we were to say that at some time the whole Church was corrupted and later converted again. Fourthly, he prayed for the one to whom he said: “Confirm thy brethren.”

Yet the Church does not have brothers whom she ought or can confirm for who, I ask, can be imagined as a brother of the universal Church? Are not all the faithful her sons?

2) The second exposition is from certain men who live in this time. They teach that the Lord only prayed in this passage for the perseverance of Peter in the grace of God even to the end. Yet against this, firstly the Lord prayed a little after for the perseverance of all the Apostles, nay more, even of all the elect, for in John 17 he said: "O holy Father, preserve them whom you have given me in your name." Thus there would be no reason why he should pray for Peter's perseverance twice. Secondly, because without a doubt the Lord asked something special for Peter, which is clear from the designation of a certain person; but perseverance in grace is a common gift of all the elect. Thirdly, because it is certain that the Lord at least mediately prayed in this place for the other Apostles. Therefore, he prefaced the purpose of this prayer: "Satan has asked that he might sift *you*," and afterward added just as the effect: "Confirm thy brethren." Therefore, the Lord did not pray only for Peter's perseverance but to grant some gift upon Peter for the use of the others. Fourthly, the gift asked for Peter in this citation also pertains to the successors. For Christ prayed for Peter to the advantage of the Church; but the Church always needs someone by whom she is confirmed, whose faith cannot fail. For the devil did not ask only to sift those who were at that time faithful but everyone altogether; nevertheless, certainly this gift of perseverance does not pertain to all the successors of Peter. Next, the Lord did not say I have prayed that your charity shall not fail but your faith, and really we know that Peter failed in charity and grace when he denied the Lord, but we know his faith did not fail.

3) Therefore, the true exposition is that the Lord asked for two privileges for Peter. One, that he could not ever lose the true faith insofar as he was tempted by the Devil, and that is something more than the gift of perseverance. For the Lord said to persevere even to the end; although Peter fell in the meantime, he still rose again in the end and was discovered faithful, since the Lord prayed for Peter that he could never fall because he held fast to the faith.

The second privilege is that he, as the Pope, could never teach something against the faith, or that there would never be found one in his see who

would teach against the true faith. From these privileges, we see that the first did not remain to his successors, but the second without a doubt did.

Concerning the first privilege, we have the express testimony of the Fathers. St. Augustine said: "When he asked that his faith would not fail, he asked that he would have the freest, strongest, unconquered perseverance of the will in faith." [382](#) St. John Chrysostom says: "He did not say, 'You will not deny me,' but, 'that thy faith should not fail.' For by Christ's care and favor it came about that the faith of Peter did not altogether vanish."

[383](#) Theophylactus said, commenting on Luke 22, "Although you must be struck for a short time, you have the seeds of reformed faith, even if the spirit will throw off the leaves of the first, still the root will live, and thy faith will not fail." Here, he explains with an elegant similitude that Peter, by denying Christ, lost the confession of the faith which is made with the mouth, which the words about the leaves mean; but the faith which is believed with the heart unto justice would not be lost. Prosper of Aquitaine explains this in the same manner. [384](#) Although the rest of the Fathers do not call to mind the other privilege, still they do not deny that, nor could they deny it, unless they would contradict many other Fathers.

On the second privilege, we have, in the first place, the testimonies of seven Fathers who were also holy Popes. Lucius I, a Pope and martyr said, "The Roman Apostolic Church is the mother of all churches and has never been shown to have wandered from the path of apostolic tradition; nor being deformed, succumbed to heretical novelties, according to the promise of the Lord himself, saying, 'I have prayed for thee, etc.'" [385](#) Pope Felix I, speaking on the Roman Church, said: "As it took up in the beginning the norm of the Christian Faith from its authors, the princes of the Apostles of Christ, she remains unsullied according to what the Lord said: 'I have prayed for thee, etc.'"

Pope Leo I said, "The special care of Peter is received from the Lord; he prayed for the faith of Peter in particular inasmuch as the state of the others would be more certain if the mind of the prince were not conquered. Therefore, in Peter the strength of all is fortified and the help of divine grace is so ordered that the strength which was given to Peter through Christ would be conferred through Peter to the remaining Apostles." In that citation, Leo recognizes both privileges; the first when he says: "If the mind

of the prince was not conquered.” The second, when he adds: “The strength which was given to Peter through Christ would be conferred through Peter to the remaining Apostles.” For strength is not conferred upon others except by expressing the true faith.

Next, Pope Agatho said in a letter which was read in the Sixth Council, Act 4, and afterwards in Act 8 and approved by all, “This is the rule of the true faith, which both in prosperity and in adversity the Apostolic Church of Christ has vivaciously held fast, which has been shown to have never wandered from the path of Apostolic tradition, by the grace of God, nor being deformed, succumbed to heretical novelties since it was said to Peter: ‘Simon, Simon, behold ... but I have prayed for thee, etc.’ Here the Lord promised that the faith of Peter was not going to fail, and admonished him to confirm his brethren. The fact that the Apostolic Pontiffs, predecessors of my lowliness, always did this from the divine assurance is recognized by all.”

Pope Nicholas I said: “The privileges of this see are perpetual, divinely rooted and also planted. One can strike against them but not transfer them; one can drag them but not tear them out. Those matters which were formerly your imperium remain, thanks be to God, insofar as they are inviolate; they will remain after you and so long as the Christian name will be preached, they will not cease to exist. ... For among other things, these privileges are especially conferred through us, ‘Thou later being converted,’ he heard from the Lord, ‘confirm thy brethren.’” [386](#)

Leo IX said in an epistle to Peter of Antioch, “Without a doubt, it was for he alone whom the Lord and Savior asserted that he prayed that his faith would not fail, saying, ‘I have prayed for thee, etc.’ Such a venerable and efficacious prayer obtained that to this point the faith of Peter has not failed, nor can it be believed that it is ever going to fail in his throne.” Pope Innocent III, in an epistle to the bishop of Arles said: “The Fathers, for the sake of the Church, understood especially in regard to articles of faith that those words refer to the see of Peter, who knew the Lord had prayed for him lest his faith would fail.” [387](#) It seems that these pontiffs should be believed, both because they were saints, and because without a doubt the authority of their see must especially be noted.

Apart from these Popes, other authors are not lacking who express the point in the same way. Theophylactus, in chapter 21 of Luke, openly

teaches that this privilege was given to Peter because he was going to be the prince and head of others; hence it was given to all the others that would succeed him in that supremacy: “Because I have you as a prince of the disciples, confirm the others. This is fitting for you, who are the rock of the Church after me, as well as the foundation.” St. Peter Chrysologus said: “We exhort you, Honorable Brother, that you would obediently attend to that which has been written by the Pope of the city of Rome because Blessed Peter, who lives in his own See and presides there, is in charge of all those seeking the truth of faith.” For although this author does not cite that passage of the Gospel: “I have prayed for thee, etc.,” still, in the matter he considers without any doubt and faithfully affirms that the truth of faith is supplied to all those seeking it from the Roman See.

St. Bernard says, “It is fitting that every danger and scandal of the kingdom of God be referred to your apostolate and especially these which touch upon the faith. For I regard it worthy that there, above all, dangers to the faith are mended, where one cannot think the faith is lacking. For to what other see was it ever said: ‘I have prayed for thee, that thy faith not fail?’” [388](#)

Our adversaries, however, object to this explanation. Firstly, because there was no Roman Church when Christ promised to Peter that his faith would not fail nor did the Lord ever mention the Roman See. Therefore, how can it be gathered that the Lord promised something to the Roman See when he said, “I have prayed for thee, etc.”? Secondly, because if what is said to Peter, “I have prayed for thee, etc.” is said to the successors, then: “And after thou being converted,” was also said to the successors, then all the successors of Peter at some time denied Christ and later were converted.

I respond to the first: Christ is said to have prayed for the Roman See because he prayed for Peter and his successors, whose See was established at Rome.

To the second I say, 1) it is not absurd if we say that “being converted” is not referred to the penance of Peter but to the temptations of the others. Therefore, the sense should not be: *Being converted from sin to penance, confirm thy brethren*, but, *thou, whose faith cannot fail, when you will have seen the others wavering and vacillating, being converted to then confirm them*. For he had not yet preached to Peter about his fall, but he was going to a little after, so it seems absurd if he should first preach conversion rather

than aversion, resurrection rather than the fall. 2) I say that if we were to explain “being converted” from negation, it does not necessarily agree with the successors of Peter to be converted from the sin of denial although necessarily “confirm the brethren” still would fit them. For being converted from sin does not agree with men except insofar as they are private persons, and therefore is a personal gift; to confirm brethren agrees with men as they are the head and prince of others and pass it on to their successors.

Secondly, the same conclusion is proven from that promise made to Peter in Matthew 16: “Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.” For as we showed above, [389](#) Peter is called literally the rock and foundation of the Church as the supreme ruler of the Church and hence his successor is similarly the rock and foundation of the Church. Thereupon we take up a two-fold argument.

First, why would the Pope be called rock, from the name of Peter, except because of constancy and solidity? Certainly if he is rock, he will not be broken nor carried around on every wind of doctrine. He will not err in faith at least insofar as he is the rock, that is, insofar as he is the Pope.

Second, by reason of the foundation holding up the building, which in no way can come to ruin. For if the building is such that it cannot fall to ruin, certainly its foundation cannot come to ruin. For it cannot be understood how the foundation would be destroyed and the house not fall. Nay more, for greater reasoning the foundation cannot be destroyed if the house cannot fall. For the foundation receives nothing from the house, but the house receives strength from the foundation, and in this way all the Fathers express and deduce that Peter—and consequently the other Popes—cannot err. Origen says on this citation: “It is manifest, even if it were not expressed, because the gates of hell can prevail against neither Peter nor the Church, for if they prevailed against the rock on which the Church was founded, they would prevail against the Church.”

Chrysostom says in this place, that only God could establish that the Church could be founded upon one fisherman, an ignoble man, and not fall through so many invading storms. Cyril (quoted in the *Catena Aurea* of St. Thomas) says on this point, “According to this promise, the Apostolic Church of Peter remains Immaculate from all seduction and heretical deceit, etc.” [390](#) Theodoret said, “This Holy See holds the reign of the Churches of the world, not only on account of other things, but also because she

remains free from the heretical stench.” [391](#) There Theodoret seems to argue thus: the rule of the whole Church ought to be of that see which cannot fail in faith; we see, however, that only the Roman See is and was free of every heretical depravity; therefore, it is manifest that it is the one to which the rule of the churches was granted.

Jerome, in an epistle to Pope Damasus on the term *hypostasis*, just after saying: “I know that the Church was built upon this rock,” he adds: “I ask that authority be given me by your letter either of not saying a word or else of saying three hypostases; I will not fear to say three hypostases if you bid it be said.” There he asserts that he is going to safely follow the judgment of the Pope because he knows that upon him the Church was founded. It cannot happen that the foundation of the Church would fall. St. Augustine speaks in similar fashion against the Donatists: “Count the priests even from the very See of Peter; in the order of the Fathers who you see have succeeded the other, it is the very rock which the proud gates of hell shall not conquer.” [392](#)

Gelasius, in an epistle to Emperor Anastasius, said: “This is what the Apostolic See guards against with all her strength because the glorious confession of the Apostle is the root of the world, so that she is polluted by no crack of depravity and altogether no contagion. For if such a thing would ever occur (which may God forbid and we trust cannot be), why would we make bold to resist any error?” Here Gelasius teaches that the Apostolic See cannot err because its preaching and confession is the root of the world; if it should err, the world would err.

St. Gregory the Great shows that it cannot happen that the bishop of Constantinople could be a universal bishop, and hence the head of the Church, because many bishops of Constantinople were public heretics; nay more, even heresiarchs such as Macedonius and Nestorius. For it seems to follow that the whole Church would fall to ruin if he who is universal would do so. [393](#) He speaks likewise to Eulogius: “Who does not know that the whole Church was strengthened in the firmness of the prince of the Apostles, to whom it was said, ‘Upon this rock I will build my Church, ... and thou, being converted, confirm thy brethren?’” [394](#) There Gregory clearly teaches that the strength of the Church depends upon the strength of Peter, and hence Peter is less able to err than the Church herself.

Thirdly, it is proved from that we read in John 21: “Feed my sheep.” For what do we gather from these words but that the Pontiff was established as Pastor and Doctor of the whole Church, the proof of which was given above. [395](#) Hence the argument is thus: The Pope is the Teacher and Shepherd of the whole Church; thus, the whole Church is so bound to hear and follow him that if he would err, the whole Church would err.

Now our adversaries respond that the Church ought to hear him so long as he teaches correctly, for God must be heard more than men.

On the other hand, who will judge whether the Pope has taught rightly or not? For it is not for the sheep to judge whether the shepherd wanders off, not even and especially in those matters which are truly doubtful. Nor do Christian sheep have any greater judge or teacher to whom they might have recourse. As we showed above, [396](#) from the whole Church one can appeal to the Pope, yet from him no one is able to appeal; therefore necessarily the whole Church will err if the Pontiff would err.

Again, however, they respond that one can have recourse to a general Council. But this is also not so; as we will show in the treatise on councils, the Pope is above a Council and it is certain that general councils often erred when they lacked the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff; this is clear from the Second Council of Ephesus, the Council of Armenia, and others. Now they will respond again: one can have recourse to a general council in which the Pope is present, for a council with a Pope is something greater than the Pope alone. Still, in the first place the Lord said only to Peter: “I have prayed for thee, etc.,” and “Feed my sheep;” he did not say this to Peter and a council. Likewise, he only calls Peter the rock and foundation, not Peter with a council; from which it appears that the whole strength of legitimate councils rests upon the Pope, not partly on the Pope and partly on a council. Next, a general council often cannot be gathered, just as it could not be done in the first three centuries on account of the persecutions of the heathen, and without a doubt the Church could persevere in that state even to the end of the world; therefore, there ought to be in the Church, even without a general council, some judge who could not err. Thereupon, what if in some council the Fathers should dissent from their president, that is, the council from the Supreme Pontiff while present and presiding, what would happen then? Would there be no remedy? Certainly there must be some judge. Moreover, the council could not be a judge in that case because

when councils disagree with the Pope they can err, and have erred in fact, as we said about the Second Council of Ephesus and others; therefore it remains that the Pope must be a judge, and hence he cannot err.

Fourthly, it is proved from the Old Testament, which was a figure of the New. In Exodus 28:4 the Lord commands doctrine and truth to be placed in the judgment of the high priest, which is *or-eem tu-meem* (perfect lights) in Hebrew. Moreover, it must be observed that there is no agreement among the Jews nor even among Christians on what these two things might be. Rabbi Salomon would have it that it is the name of God *ye-cho-vach* (Jehova) written in a judgment, whose lightening the priests recognized as a divine response, since someone requested it. Arias Montanus teaches in his *Apparatus* that they are two very lucid stones that were produced immediately by God Himself and given to Moses. Josephus says that these are twelve stones in which were written the names of the twelve sons of Israel (Jacob) whom God commanded to be placed in the accounting, and he also mixes in many fables. [397](#) St. Augustine gives a more probable explanation that these very words were written in golden letters in the middle of the burse which hung before the breast of the priest.

What the Jews and Judaizers say does not hinder this explanation, namely that *or-eem* does not mean doctrine, but splendors, from the root *or* (light); and *tu-meem*, does not mean to mean the truth, but perfection, from the root *ta-maam* (perfect). Yet, Jerome must be believed more than the rabbis. He translates “doctrine and truth” along with the translators of the Septuagint, who likewise translate it: “*delōsin kai alētheian*,” and hence it must be said that *or-eem* comes from the root *ya-raat*, which is *he taught*, and *tu-meem* comes from the root *a-man*, *he believed*.

Furthermore, why doctrine and truth would be written on the breast of the priest is explained in Deuteronomy 17, where the Lord commanded those who doubt the understanding of divine law should go up to the high priest, seek from him the solution and add, “Those things which he will show, let them be the truth of judgment to you.” And therefore, by sign and word the Lord promised that on the breast of the high priest he was going to have doctrine and truth, and hence he was not going to err when he taught the people. But if this was fitting to the Aaronic priesthood, how much more fitting is it for the Christian priesthood? For this reason St. Peter Chrysologus, as was said a little before, exhorted Eutyches: “We exhort you, Honorable Brother, that you would obediently attend to that which has

been written by the Pope of the city of Rome, because Blessed Peter, who lives in his own See, and presides there, is in charge of all those seeking the truth of faith.”

Fifthly, it is proven from experience, and in that two-fold. For in the first place, it is certain that all patriarchal sees so fell from the faith that heretics sat in them teaching others their heresy, with the exception of the Roman See. The heresiarchs Macedonius, Nestorius, and Sergius sat in the See of Constantinople. The Arians Georgius and Lucis, along with Dioscorus the Monophysite, Cyrus the Monothelite, and many others sat in Alexandria. At Antioch there was Paul of Samosata, Peter Gnaphaeus the Monophysite, Macharius the Monothelite, and others. John the follower of Origen, and before him Eutychus, Irenaeus and Hilary the Arians sat in Jerusalem. No such thing can be shown from the Roman Church, from which it appears that the Lord truly prayed for it lest its faith would fail. For this reason, Ruffinus states in his exposition of the Creed: “In the Church of the City of Rome, no heresy ever had its beginning, and there the ancient custom is preserved.”

The second thing which experience shows is that the Roman Pontiff has condemned a great many heresies without a general council, namely that of Pelagius, Priscillia, Jovinian, Vigilantius, and many others, whom the whole Church held as true heretics and shuddered at them simply because the Roman Church had condemned them. Therefore, it is a sign that the whole Church believes that the Roman Pontiff cannot err in matters of this sort. See also Prosper of Aquitaine in the last book against Collator and Peter the deacon. [398](#)

CHAPTER IV: On the Roman Church in Particular.

THE SECOND proposition. *Not only can the Roman Pontiff not err in faith, but even the particular Roman Church cannot err.*

In this place it must be observed that the strength of the Roman Church in faith should be received in one sense, and the strength of the Pontiff in another. The Pope cannot err from a judicial error, that is, while he judges and defines a question of faith; but the Roman Church, that is, the people and the Roman clergy, cannot so err from a personal error so that everyone would err and there would be no faithful in the Roman Church adhering to the Pope. Even though individuals might err on their own, still it cannot happen that all will err as a body and the whole Roman Church become apostate.

Moreover, that the Roman Church cannot err in the manner explained can still be understood in two ways: In one way, that it cannot err while the Apostolic See continues to be at Rome; it would be otherwise if the See were to be transferred somewhere else. In the second way, that it simply cannot err or defect because the Apostolic See can never be transferred from Rome to another place. And indeed, following the earlier sense, our proposition is very true and perhaps as true as the first proposition concerning the Pope. For the authors we cited, such as Pope Lucius and Felix, martyrs, Agatho and Nicholas, confessors, and likewise Cyril and Ruffinus, all assert that not only the Pope but also the Roman Church cannot err.

Besides, St. Cyprian says, “They dared to sail to the chair of Peter and the principal Church, for they do not consider it is the Roman See, where treachery can gain no inroad.” [399](#) St. Jerome said: “The Roman faith was praised by the apostolic voice; it does not receive deceptions of this sort. Even if an angel will announce differently than once was preached, by the authority of Paul, it cannot be changed.” St. Gregory Nazianzen, in a poem about his life, around the middle said, “Old Rome has from ancient times held the right faith, and always retained it; just as it is fitting for the city

which presides over the whole world, it always holds the faith whole from God.”

I add even the testimony of two Popes, who also were condemned by heretics, but were received with the greatest honor by Catholics. One is Pope Martin V, who in his Bull, which he published approving the Council of Constance, thought that they who thought differently than the Roman Church or the Sacraments or on the articles of faith should be held as heretics.

The other is Pope Sixtus IV, who first through the Synod of Alcalá, then by himself, condemned the articles of a certain Peter of Oxford, one of which was that the Church of the city of Rome could err. And although this seems to be understood particularly on account of the Pope, still, because the Roman Church is not only the Pope but the Pope and the people, then when the Fathers or Popes say the Roman Church cannot err they mean that in the Roman Church there is always going to be a bishop teaching in a Catholic way and a people believing in a Catholic way.

But following the second sense, that the Roman Church cannot defect, is certainly pious and a very probable opinion; still it is not so certain that the contrary can be called heretical, or manifestly erroneous, as John Driedo teaches. [400](#) The fact is, it is not completely *de fide* that the Roman Church cannot be separated from the Apostolic See since neither Scripture nor tradition has the Apostolic See so fixed at Rome that it could not be transferred elsewhere. And all the testimonies of the Popes and Fathers (who say the Roman Church cannot err) can be related about the Roman Church as long as it shall remain in that Apostolic See, but not absolutely and simply.

Just the same, it is still a pious and very probable opinion that the chair of Peter cannot be separated from Rome, and hence the Roman Church absolutely cannot err or defect. It is proved firstly from the fact that the Apostolic See has remained in Rome for such a long time in spite of infinite persecutions as well as opportunities to move elsewhere. The first reason offered the greatest occasion to transfer the Roman See into another place in the times of the heathen emperors. They were very disturbed that the Apostolic See was in Rome, and for that reason whenever they heard a new bishop had been created, he was either killed or sent off into exile. Hence Cyprian praised the constancy of Pope Cornelius: “How great was the

strength in the reception of his Episcopate? How great a strength of soul, what kind of strength of faith? Fearless he sat at Rome in the sacerdotal chair, in that time when the dangerous tyrant rounded up the priests of God by both lawful and unlawful means, although he heard that an envious prince had risen against him much more patiently and tolerably than that a priest of God had been constituted at Rome.” [401](#)

The next occasion to transfer the see occurred in the time of the Goths, particularly during the time of Innocent I when Alaric took Rome, despoiled and burned it, as Jerome relates in his letter to Principia on the death of Marcella. Next, in the time of Leo I, when Genseric again took Rome and despoiled it, as Blondus writes, [402](#) in which period Rome remained for some space of time without an inhabitant. Again in the time of Pope Vigilius, Totila, having brought down a great part of the walls and burning nearly all the houses, nearly overthrew Rome, laid desolate the city and neither man nor women remained therein, as Blondus writes in the same work. [403](#) After that, in the whole time of the Lombards, the Roman Pontiffs were in the greatest misery, as is clear from many epistles of St. Gregory. Yet the Roman Pontiffs never thought of changing their Episcopate from Rome.

The third occasion of transferring the see was in the time of St. Bernard, on account of the persecution of the citizens of Rome. For so many years, Roman citizens had so troubled their Pontiffs that they were often compelled to leave the city into exile, as is certain both from historians and from St. Bernard. [404](#)

The fourth occasion was when the Roman Pontiffs remained in France for 70 years. Firstly, although they bided their time far away from Rome with the whole curia, why, I ask, did they not transfer the see? Why did they not exchange the Roman episcopate for that of Avignon? Since there were so many occasions to transfer it but still the see remained in Rome for more than 1500 years, it is very probable that it can in no way be transferred.

Secondly, this same thing can be proven from the fact that God himself commanded the Apostolic See of Peter to be established in Rome. Men cannot change anything that God commands. Blessed Marcellus, Pope and martyr, in an epistle to the people of Antioch, witnesses this command when he says that Peter, at God’s bidding, transferred his seat from Antioch

to Rome. St. Ambrose also witnesses this in his oration on the handing over of the basilicas, where he relates that Christ altogether willed that Peter should die at Rome. And for this reason when Christ met Peter fleeing from the city, he [Christ] said, “I am coming to Rome to be crucified again.” It is a manifest sign that God wanted to confirm the See of Peter at Rome through his death. What Pope St. Leo I says also pertains to this: “The trophy of the cross of Christ you bore to the bitter Romans, where you, by divine pre-ordination, went ahead and obtained the honor of power and glory of the passion.” [405](#)

Someone will say that it seems that this argument proves that the see cannot be transferred from Rome. For if it is of the faith, divine precepts cannot be changed by men; if therefore God commanded the see to be constituted at Rome, it would seem to be *de fide* that it cannot be transferred anywhere else.

I respond: That does not follow, for Marcellus and Leo do not define this matter as if it were *de fide*; rather they tell it as history. Moreover, they are not *de fide* accounts of the Pontiffs but only decrees. Next, what they themselves say, that at the Lord’s command Peter transferred his see into the city, can be understood in two ways: 1) because the Lord commanded this when he appeared to Peter and then truly it was said by divine precept that the See of Peter was constituted at Rome; or 2) that Christ indeed did not clearly command it but that he said it was commanded because Peter did it by God’s inspiration, just as all decrees and precepts of the Church can be said to be divine, which still are nevertheless changeable.

It happens that even if it were established that Christ commanded Peter that he should place his See in Rome, still it would not immediately follow that the command to do this was unchangeable. Because it is not certain how Christ commanded Peter that he should establish his see at Rome, therefore it is not *de fide* divine and immutable precept that the see was constituted at Rome. Still, as we said, it is very probable and is piously believed. Nor is it opposed that in the time of Antichrist Rome must be destroyed and burned, as is deduced from chapter 17 of the Apocalypse. For this will not be until the end of the world, and besides the Supreme Pontiff is called the Roman Pontiff and he will survive even though he will not live at Rome, just as he did in the time of Totila the king of the Goths as we said above. Besides, Augustine and many others commenting on that passage of

the Apocalypse would not have it that Rome must be burned, but the multitude of the impious, which is the city of the devil.

CHAPTER V: On Decrees of Morals.

THE THIRD proposition is thus: *Not only can the Supreme Pontiff not err in decrees of faith, but even in precepts of morals which are prescribed for the whole Church and which in matters necessary to salvation or in those matters treated which in themselves are good or evil.*

1) We say that the Pope cannot err in precepts which are prescribed for the whole Church since, as we said above, in precepts and particular judgments it is not absurd for the Pope to err. 2) We add in the second place that he cannot err in those matters which are necessary to salvation, or that are good and evil in themselves. Still, it is not erroneous to say the Pope in all his laws can err, without a doubt by fashioning a superfluous law, or one less discreet, etc. And we will declare the whole matter by examples. It cannot happen that the Pope would err by commanding some vice like usury, or by forbidding some virtue like restitution, since these are in themselves good or evil; nor can it happen that he would err by commanding something against salvation, like circumcision, or the Sabbath, or by forbidding something necessary for salvation, like Baptism and Eucharist. Although these things might not be good or evil in themselves, nevertheless, it is not absurd to say it can happen that he might bid something which is neither good nor evil in itself, or against salvation, but that is simply useless or he might command under some grave penalty; although it is not for subordinates to doubt on such a matter, but simply obey.

Now the proposition is proved: 1) It cannot happen that the Pope would err in precepts of morals necessary to salvation because then the whole Church would be gravely wounded in necessary matters, contrary to the promise of the Lord. “When the Spirit of truth will come, he will teach you all truth.” [406](#) That is understood (at least) on a truth necessary to salvation. 2) Because then God would fail his Church in necessary matters, seeing that he would have commanded her that she should follow the Pope and yet permit the Pope to err in necessary matters. But if God is absent from no affair in regard to necessity, how much less from his Church? Moreover, that the Pope cannot err in morals that are in themselves good or

bad is proved; for the Church could not be called holy as in the Creed. She is called holy chiefly due to holy profession, as we showed in another place, because without a doubt she declares a law and holy profession that teaches nothing false and commands nothing evil. Secondly, because then necessarily she would err concerning faith. For Catholic faith teaches that every truth is good, every vice is evil; but if the Pope would err by commanding vices or by forbidding virtues, the Church would be held to believe vices are good and virtues are bad, unless she would sin against conscience.

CHAPTER VI: On the Pope as a Particular Person.

THE FOURTH proposition. It is probable and may piously be believed that not only as 'Pope' can the Supreme Pontiff not err, but he cannot be a heretic even as a particular person by pertinaciously believing something false against the faith. It is proved: 1) because it seems to require the sweet disposition of the providence of God.

For the Pope not only should not, but cannot preach heresy, but rather should always preach the truth. He will certainly do that, since the Lord commanded him to confirm his brethren, and for that reason added: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith shall not fail," that is, that at least the preaching of the true faith shall not fail in thy throne. How, I ask, will a heretical Pope confirm the brethren in faith and always preach the true faith? Certainly God can wrench the confession of the true faith out of the heart of a heretic just as he placed the words in the mouth of Balaam's ass. Still, this will be a great violence, and not in keeping with the providence of God that sweetly disposes all things.

2) It is proved *ab eventu*. For to this point no [Pontiff] has been a heretic, or certainly it cannot be proven that any of them were heretics; therefore it is a sign that such a thing cannot be. [407](#)

CHAPTER VII: The Objections Are Answered by an Appeal to Reason.

NOW we take up arguments to the contrary, partly from reason and partly from the examples of various Pontiffs. 1) Many canons teach that the Pope cannot be judged unless he may be discovered to have deviated from the faith; therefore he can deviate from the faith.

Otherwise these canons would be to no effect. This is clear from the preceding canon, *Si Papa*, dist. 40, from the 5th Council under Symachus, from the Eighth General Council, action 7, from the third epistle of Anacletus, the second epistle of Eusebius, and from Innocent III. [408](#)

I respond to the first: All of those canons speak on a personal error of the Pope, not a judicial one. For the Pontiff, if he could be a heretic, will only be so by denying some truth that has already been defined; he cannot be a heretic when he defines something new since in that instance he does not understand contrary to something defined by the Church. But the canons cited speak expressly on heresy; therefore they do not speak on the judicial error but personal error of the Pontiff. Secondly, I say those canons do not mean the Pope can err as a private person but only that the Pope cannot be judged; it is still not altogether certain whether the Pontiff could be a heretic or not. Thus, they add the condition 'if he might become a heretic' for greater caution.

2) If the Pope alone can infallibly define dogmas of faith then councils are in vain or at least unnecessary.

I respond: That does not follow. For even if infallibility might be in the Pontiff still he ought not condemn human and ordinary means whereby one can arrive at a truth of faith in the treatment of some matter. Moreover, a greater or lesser council is an ordinary medium for the magnitude or paucity of a matter that it treats. That is clear from the example of the Apostles. Certainly both Peter and Paul were able to infallibly define any controversy you like as individuals but they still called a council in Acts chapter 15.

Next, definitions of the faith especially depend on the Apostolic tradition and the consensus of the churches, but so that the opinion of the whole Church might be recognized when some question arises, they preserve the tradition of the Church of Christ. There is no better plan to do this than if the bishops from all the provinces should come together into one to relate the custom of his Church.

Besides, councils are very useful and often necessary to really put an end to controversies by not only making decrees on faith, but also preserving them. For when a general council happens all the bishops subscribe and profess themselves to embrace that decree, and afterward they will preach in their churches; but if a general council does not happen, it is not so easy to reduce a decree made on faith to practice. It is possible that some may feign ignorance of the decree; others might complain they were not called and others even openly say the Pope could err, but on this matter we will speak more in the treatise on *Councils*, chapter X and XI.

3) If the Pope were infallible in a judgment of faith, they would be heretics or at least held in pernicious error and sin gravely who pertinaciously assert something against a definition of the Pope. But this is false, for St. Cyprian pertinaciously resisted Pope Stephen when he defined that heretics must not be rebaptized, as is clear from the epistle of the same Cyprian to Pompeius, and still not only was he not a heretic, but he did not sin mortally. For mortal sins are not blotted out except through Penance, even if one should die for the faith. Still, the Church venerates Cyprian as a saint, even though he does not appear to have ever repudiated his own error. This is confirmed by St. Augustine who says that the churches gave way on that question and Cyprian, as well as others, could dissent for the sake of charity among themselves until a definition of a general council would come about. [409](#) Therefore, Augustine did not think that a judgment of the Roman Pontiff was beyond doubt.

I respond to the example of Cyprian: Cyprian certainly was not a heretic, both because those who say that the Pope can err are not reckoned manifestly heretical, but also because there is no question that Pope Stephen did not define as *de fide* that heretics must not be rebaptized, although he commanded this not to be done, as is clear from the fact that he did not excommunicate Cyprian and others thinking the contrary. In like manner, Cyprian refused that it be held as *de fide* when he defined in the Council of 80 bishops that heretics must be rebaptized, protesting eloquently that he

did not wish to separate himself from others because they thought differently.

Nor is this opposed to what Eusebius [410](#) and Augustine [411](#) write. Pope Stephen did not forbid those baptized by heretics should be rebaptized; but when he also opined that those who did not obey must be excommunicated, that was but a threat. For it is certain from St. Vincent of Lérin in his book on profane novelties of speech, and from Augustine (loc. cit.) that Stephen and Cyprian were always in union.

Through this a response can also be made to confirm it. For after the definition of the Pope he was still free to think otherwise, as Augustine says, because the Pope refused to make the matter *de fide* without a general council: rather he merely wished for the ancient custom to be preserved. Whether Cyprian sinned mortally by not obeying the Pontiff is not at all certain. For on his side it did not seem a mortal sin, because he did not sin but from ignorance; for he thought the Pope perniciously erred, and standing on that opinion, he felt obliged not to obey lest he would act against his conscience. But it does not seem the ignorance of Cyprian was crass, nor feigned; but it is probable and hence excuses from mortal sin. For he knew the Pope did not define the matter as *de fide* and saw that the Council of 80 bishops agreed with him. Why else would Blessed Augustine expressly teach that Cyprian only sinned venially and for the sake of charity, so it was easily purged by the knife of martyrdom? [412](#) Augustine also says that this sin was like a blemish in the glory of his holy soul, which the abundance of charity covered.

On the other hand, it seems he still sinned mortally since he did not obey the expressed apostolic precept, and disturbed the Pontiff without measure when he thought correctly. Even if Stephan did not define the matter as *de fide*, still he lately commanded that heretics should not be rebaptized, as Cyprian himself affirms in his epistle to Pompeius. Cyprian ought to obey his command and subject his judgment to the judgment of his superior, and at least ought not have advanced contumelious words, such as he advanced against Pope Stephen in his epistle to Pompeius, where he calls him proud, unlearned, blind and a fool, etc. Therefore, St. Augustine in his 48th Epistle to Vincentium, while he otherwise tries to defend Cyprian, asserted that where the contumelies are discovered these were either not his writings, or

that afterward he did penance for his error and changed his opinion before death, although no retraction was discovered.

4) The African Council asserts in its epistle to Pope Celestine that a provincial council can err less in judgment than the Roman Pontiff: “Perhaps there is not anyone who would believe God can inspire justice of examination in each of us and reject the innumerable priests gathered in Council.” But it is certain provincial councils can err; consequently the Pope can err much more.

I respond: The council speaks not on a judgment of faith but of fact, namely on the cases of bishops and priests who are accused of some crime. In cases like this, we affirm the Pope does not have the assistance of the Holy Spirit by whose assistance he cannot err. Additionally, we are not necessarily held to believe something these bishops say in that epistle, especially since it sufficiently appears that they were moved by the crimes of Apiarius who had fled to the Roman Pontiff after he had in some measure exceeded the boundaries of polite speech. That the African Council was confirmed by Leo IV [413](#) does not oppose this since the decrees of the council were confirmed, but not of the epistle.

5) Nilos Cabásilas reasons this way in his little book on the primacy, “The Roman Pontiff can fall into any other vice, like avarice or pride, etc., therefore he can also fall into the vice of heresy. For Paul says some men were shipwrecked in regard to the faith, because beforehand they had lost a good conscience. [414](#) Likewise the Pope can deny God in deed by living badly, according to Titus 1: ‘They confessed that they know God, but deny him with their deeds.’ Therefore, he can also deny in deed for it seems easier to deny by word than by deed.”

I respond to the first argument: Therein it is gathered correctly that the Pope by his own nature can fall into heresy, but not when we posit the singular assistance of God which Christ asked for him by his prayer. Furthermore, Christ prayed lest his faith would fail, not lest he would fall into vice.

To the second point, I say: The Apostle in that place does not understand any evil work you like, but works that proceed from infidelity of heart. For he speaks on the Jews that did not sincerely convert to the faith and profess that they know God but nevertheless, deny him by works because, by

forbidding certain foods as unclean by their nature, they showed that they did not truly know the creator of all things.

Moreover, the Pope does not, nor can, do such works. But if by “deeds” we understand whatever sin you like, it would be false since it is easier to deny God by word than by deed. For who denies by word, denies simply and expressly, who denies by deed, denies him implicitly and in a certain measure, not simply.

CHAPTER VIII: On the Errors Which Are Falsely Ascribed to the Roman Pontiffs Peter, Linus, Anacletus, Thelesphorus, Victor, Zephyrinus, Urban, Pontian, Cornelius and Marcellinus, Who Were Not Only Popes, but Also Martyrs.

LET us now come to the individual Popes whom our adversaries contend have erred. The first is Peter. Nilos Cabásilas, in his book, *On the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff*, writes that Peter erred not only once but twice concerning faith. Further, he even supposes that by this argumentation he has proven that the Roman Pontiffs can err in faith. Certainly no Roman Pontiff received greater privileges from God than Peter. Moreover, it is clear from Scripture that Peter erred twice, both when he denied Christ, [415](#) and when he compelled the Gentiles to Judaize.

[416](#) The Lutheran Centuriators of Magdeburg add, apart from these two errors, another thirteen falls of St. Peter, on which we wrote elsewhere.

[417](#)

We respond: When St. Peter denied Christ, he had not yet begun to be the Supreme Pontiff, for it is certain that ecclesiastical rule was handed to him by Christ in the last chapter of John, since the Lord said to him after the resurrection: “Simon, son of John, feed my sheep.” Therefore, that denial of Peter cannot be numbered among errors of the Roman Pontiffs. Besides, I add that Peter denied Christ with words, but not truly in his heart; hence Peter did not throw off the confession of faith, nor faith itself, as we showed previously.

Now, on the other hand, when St. Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaize, this was not an error of preaching but of conduct, as Tertullian suggests in his work *de Praescriptionibus adversus haereticos*. St. Peter did not ratify by some decree that they must Judaize; rather, he formally taught the contrary in Acts 15. Nevertheless, when he was still in Antioch, he separated himself from the dinner table of the Gentiles lest he would give offense to those recently converted to the faith from the Jews, and by his example compelled them to Judaize in a certain measure, even Barnabas. But we do not deny that Popes can offer the occasion of erring through their own bad example; rather, we deny that they can prescribe the whole Church to follow some error *ex cathedra*. Moreover, the examples and doctrines of the Pontiffs are not equally pernicious to the Church, seeing that the Lord instructed them, saying: “Do what they say, but do not do what they do.”

[418](#)

The second is Linus, who immediately succeeded St. Peter in the pontifical seat. He is mocked by the Centuriators because he had forbidden women to go into church without their heads covered. [419](#) He said: “It is established that no woman (certainly worthy of episcopal care) should enter into the Church with her head uncovered.” But what if Linus would have added, that it were not fitting on account of the angels? Without a doubt they would claim that it is superstition. But the Centuriators have forgotten, I believe, that the Apostle Paul did not judge it unworthy of his care to command that women should veil their head on account of the angels; [420](#) St. Ambrose explains that this custom must be especially preserved in the Church on account of the reverence of priests, who are called “angels” in the Scripture.

The third is Anacletus, whom the Centuriators condemn in the same book, [421](#) because he built a memorial of St. Peter and adorned it. Certainly St. Peter merited so little from the Church that it was fitting for his memory to altogether cease! But if blessed Anacletus must be blamed because he established some monument for the bones of St. Peter, how much greater, I ask, was the sin of Constantine the Great, who built such a sumptuous basilica and adorned it with so many golden and silver gifts to the memory of St. Peter? But otherwise concerning all these things, all pious men judge differently than our adversaries judge them now. Certainly

the very noble writer Gaius, so near to apostolic times, as Eusebius relates, [422](#) calls the tombs of Peter and Paul the trophies of the Apostles, by which the Roman Church is fortified as if by the firmest columns.

John Chrysostom expressed his supreme desire of coming to Rome so that he could fall prostrate at the tombs of Peter and Paul. [423](#) And I ask that you listen to the great honor with which he speaks about the city of Rome as well as the bodies and tombs of the Apostles: “Just as a great and strong body has two bright eyes, (Rome) has the bodies of those saints. Heaven does not so glitter, when the sun sends forth its rays; just as the city of the Romans pouring forth the light from those two lamps throughout the world. ... How great are those two crowns that adorn the city? What golden chains encompass her about? What fonts does she have? This is why I celebrate this city, not because of its supply of gold, nor its many columns, nor on account of another fancy, but on account of those columns of the Church. Who will grant me now to throw myself around the body of Paul? To be fastened to his tomb? To see the dust of that body?” He further adds: “This body fortifies the city, which is more secure than innumerable towers, walls and ramparts; and with it is also the body of Peter. For Paul also honored him while he was alive, saying: ‘I went up to see Peter.’”

Moreover, Theodoret not only praises Rome for many things, but most especially for the tombs of the Apostles, which he says illuminate the souls of the faithful. I pass over many other testimonies that can be added since they are proper to the disputation on the relics of the saints, which will be taken up in another place.

The fourth is Thelesphorus, who was the ninth Pope after St. Peter, and ended in a glorious martyrdom, as Irenaeus witnessed. [424](#) The Centuriators accuse him in these words: “He first commanded clerics that they should fast from meat for seven weeks before Easter, although it is against what is written: ‘Let no man judge you in regard to food and drink.’ Next, he increased the Masses and augmented their rites, and also bound it to the seasons, although the Lord’s supper was not established on account of number, or ceremonies, or time. Likewise, he raised the dignity of clerics and their sanctity exceedingly above the people, as if it were not written that all are one in Christ Jesus. Moreover, he would not have priests charged or

accused by the people, and he calls that law the firmest wall of his order, constituted by himself and the Fathers against persecutors.” [425](#)

These clearly are the errors of Thelesphorus, which are judged to be errors by the Centuriators because such are against the rule of Luther; but if we judge justly, would it not rather more be said that the dogmas of Luther, which do not suffer the choice of foods, nor Masses, nor the rank of priests above the people, are erroneous and false, because they disagree with the rule of Thelesphorus? For since Thelesphorus was a saint and a martyr, and very close to the times of the Apostles, and even could have spoken with Peter, Paul and John, is it not more believable that he could better recognize the doctrine of Christ than Luther, who was not a martyr and lived 1400 years after the times of the Apostles? These are petty arguments of the Centuriators, and answered a thousand times.

For what they advance from Paul: “Let no man judge you on food and drink,” are not opposed to taking up abstinence from meat, or having such abstinence appointed to a season to subdue the wantonness of the body; rather they are opposed to those who never use certain foods for the very reason that they were unclean according to the Old Law. Thus the same citation of Paul applies to them: “Let no man judge you in food or drink, or on the day of the feast, or a new moon, or the Sabbath, which are shadows of things to come.” [426](#)

They add that the Lord’s Supper was not established in regard to number, nor in regard to rite or time; we do not deny this. But what happens from there? Did Telesphorous err on that account, when he wished three Masses to be celebrated on Christmas, and added other rites, and established the times in which Masses were to be celebrated? For although the Lord’s supper was not established in regard to number, rite and time, still the number, rite and time ought to be determined in regard to celebrating the very supper of the Lord rightly, unless perhaps order would be less fitting to such a Sacrament than disorder.

Next, they add from the Apostle: “All of you are one in Christ Jesus.” [427](#) This proves nothing less than that priests are no more worthy than laity. Paul explains precisely how we are all one in Christ when he says we are one body, where there are various members, eyes, hands, feet, and some are more noble and worthy than others. [428](#)

The fifth is Pope Victor, the fifteenth Pope from St. Peter. He was once infamously accused by certain heretics, as though he had taught that Christ was only a man, as Eusebius relates. [429](#) Yet, Eusebius proves this was a false calumny in the same place; it is certain that the prince of that heresy, Theodotus, was excommunicated by Victor.

The sixth is Pope Zephyrinus, the successor to Pope Victor, who seems to have ratified the heresy of the Montanists. Tertullian writes in his book against Praxeas, that the Roman Pontiff, recognizing the prophecies of Montanus, advanced the peace to the churches of Asia and Phrygia by that recognition and was persuaded by Praxeas to recall the letters of peace which he had already sent out. It is certain from the histories that Zephyrinus was the bishop of Rome at that time. For that reason, Rhenanus, in his annotations to Tertullian, placed this remark in the margin, that the bishop of Rome accepted Montanism. Nor can it be said that in this period this heresy was not yet condemned by the Church, since, as Tertullian says in the same place, Praxeas persuaded the Pope to recall the letters of peace, for the very reason that his predecessors had already condemned that heresy.

I respond: Trust is not to be altogether placed in Tertullian on this question, as he was a Montanist himself at this time. Just as a little earlier Artemon had falsely claimed that Victor, the Roman Pope, agreed with him (which we have already shown from Eusebius), so at this time when Tertullian was a Montanist he tried to drag the Roman Pope into the opinion of Montanus. Otherwise, why did neither Eusebius, nor anyone else, record this error in the Roman Pontiff?

Still, because often it is the case that lies are founded upon some truth, it is believable that Pope Zephyrinus was persuaded by the Montanists that the doctrine of Montanus was not different from the doctrine of the Roman Church, and therefore, the same Pope wished to restore peace to them which his predecessors had taken away. He did not even approve the error which his predecessors condemned; rather, he thought the Montanists were falsely accused concerning these errors. This is not, however, to err concerning faith nor to accept the error of Montanism, as Rhenanus pretends, but to err in his person, which happens also to many other holy men. Ruffinus writes in his book that Arius, so that he might persuade the Emperor Constantine that he was Catholic, wrote his belief by a careful artifice so that he should be reckoned as a Catholic, yet still be recognized

for what he was by his own followers. [430](#) Moreover, Pope Leo I warns that bishop in no uncertain terms to command the Pelagians returning to the Church to abjure heresy, because most of the time they deceive the Church with a confession of their faith that is so composed that they might appear Catholic, when they are not. [431](#) This very thing appears to have also happened to Pope Zephyrinus.

The seventh is Urban, the eighteenth Pope from St. Peter. The Centuriators condemn him in these words: “He established Confirmation after Baptism, but blasphemously says, through the imposition of the hands of bishops Christians receive the Holy Spirit and become fully Christian.”

[432](#) They also condemn Pope Cornelius for the same error. [433](#)

Yet, in the first place, they are lying when they say the Sacrament of Confirmation was established by Pope Urban. For its use exists in the Acts of the Apostles 8 and 19, where the Apostles impose their hands over the baptized, so that they would receive the Holy Spirit. And besides, Tertullian, who is older than both Urban and Cornelius, mentions Confirmation in many places. In his work, *de Resurrectione Carnis*, he says: “Flesh is washed, so that the soul will be without stain; the flesh is anointed, that the soul be consecrated.” And in *de Praescriptiones contra Haereticos*, speaking about the Devil, who imitates our Baptism and Confirmation: “He imbues, at any rate, certain believers and his faithful; he signs his soldiers there on the forehead.” And in *de Baptismo*: “Furthermore, going out from the laver we are anointed with blessed Unction.” And a little further: “Next the hand is imposed, calling forth through blessing and inviting the Holy Spirit.” Do you not see with Tertullian Unction, a sign on the forehead, imposition of hands, arrival of the Holy Spirit? Therefore, what could Urban establish? It is certain that Tertullian was older than Urban. For Tertullian lived in the times of the Emperor Severus, and his son Antoninus, as the Centuriators teach basing themselves on Jerome in the same volume of the *Centuries*. [434](#) What of the fact that the same Centuriators number among “the blemishes of Tertullian” that he recognized anointing after Baptism as well as the necessary sign of the Cross? Therefore, how can they embrace this idea that Confirmation was established by Urban, when they already placed it among the “blemishes of Tertullian,” who is older than Urban?

Next, when the Centuriators add that what Urban says is a blasphemy, namely that men receive the Holy Spirit and are made fully Christians through the imposition of hands of bishops, they do not require refutation, since they advance no proof. Especially when Cornelius also says the same thing, as they affirm, and even Cyprian, [435](#) Cyril, [436](#) Augustine [437](#) and other Fathers frequently do.

The Eighth Pope who is said to have erred is Pontianus, the successor of Urban. The Centuriators accuse him of writing that priests confect the body of the Lord by their own mouth, and give it to the people, and that God receives the sacrifices of others as well as forgives their sins and reconciles them through the priests. [438](#) The Centuriators so greatly call this teaching a blasphemy, but they advance nothing whereby they prove it is a blasphemy. They ought not take it so badly if we believe a holy martyr and what was established by the Apostles more than what was established by Luther, especially since we read the same thing in the writings of all the ancient Fathers.

Listen to Jerome in his epistle to Heliodorus: “Far be it that I would speak evil about anyone who, succeeding to the apostolic step, confects the body of Christ with his own holy mouth, through whom we are also Christians; who, having the keys of the kingdom of heaven, in a certain measure, judge before the day of judgment.”

Listen to Augustine, where he speaks about captive women among the barbarians: “Pray to God for them, and entreat that he would teach them to say such things as St. Azarias poured forth to God in his prayer and confessions among other things. They are thus in the land of their captivity, just as they [the Israelites] were in that land, where they could not sacrifice to the Lord in their custom; just as they cannot offer oblation at the altar of God, or discover there a priest, through whom they might offer it to God.”

[439](#)

Listen to Chrysostom, in the third book on priesthood, where he says: “To purge the leprosy of the body, or that I might speak more truly, not even to purge, but to show one has been purged, it was lawful to do so to the priests of the Jews alone. On the other hand, to our priests, I do not say to prove they have been cleansed, but that it has indeed been conceded to them to cleanse not the leprosy of the body, but the filth of the soul.” Therefore, when Pontianus says that through the priests the body of the Lord is

confected, the offerings of others are received by God and the sins of men are forgiven, he says what even the most approved authors said, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and still all the rest, whom I pass over for the sake of brevity.

The ninth is Pope Cornelius, whom the Centuriators claim taught that only water was to be offered in the chalice of the Lord. [440](#) Such an error was shown to be against the Gospel, but this is a very impudent calumny. They prove this only from what Cyprian relates to Cornelius where he makes many arguments against this error. [441](#) But Cyprian does not say this is Cornelius' error, but that of others. Next, that epistle was not written to Cornelius, but to Caecilius, a certain African bishop, as other examples show. But the Centuriators then by chance drank more liberally and with sparkling and heavy eyes read one for another. Add that Pope Alexander, the predecessor of Cornelius, already published a decree lest anyone would offer anything other than wine mixed with water in the chalice of the Lord.

Next, if from this epistle they condemn others, why do the Centuriators not condemn themselves? Accordingly, Cyprian, more often in this epistle, calls the Eucharist a sacrifice, and does not teach that only water or only wine must be offered, but water mixed with wine. The Lutherans, however, obstinately deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice and judge that only wine must be consecrated in the chalice without water.

The tenth is Pope Marcellinus, who sacrificed to idols, as is certain from the Pontifical of Damasus, the Council of Sinnessanus, and from the epistle of Nicholas I to the Emperor Michael. But Marcellinus neither taught something against faith, nor was a heretic, or unfaithful, except by an external act on account of the fear of death. Now, whether he fell from the pontificate due to that external act or not, little is related; later he abdicated the pontificate and shortly thereafter was crowned with martyrdom. Still, I believe that he would not have fallen from the pontificate *ipso facto*, because it was certain to all that he sacrificed to idols only out of fear.

CHAPTER IX: On Liberius and Felix II.

THE eleventh Pope who is accused of error is Liberius. Now, although the Centuriators do not dare to define anything on Liberius, [442](#) still, Tilman Hesh boldly affirms that he was infected with the Arian heresy. [443](#) And, of course, he has serious authors as witnesses for his opinion; St. Athanasius, [444](#) St. Jerome and Pope St. Damasus. [445](#)

I respond. There are two things certain concerning Liberius, and one in doubt. Firstly, it is certain that from the beginning of his pontificate even to exile, he suffered for the Catholic faith and was a keen defender of the Catholic religion. All writers who spoke on those times witness this fact, such as Ammianus Marcellinus, Athanasius in both *Apologies*; Ruffinus, Sulpitius Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Nicephorus. [446](#)

Secondly, it is certain that Liberius, after he returned from exile, was also truly orthodox and pious. As the Church historian Socrates writes, after he returned from exile, Liberius refused to receive the Macedonians into the Church unless they would openly lay aside heresy. [447](#) Besides, after his death, he was held as a saint, as is clear from the words of St. Ambrose: “It is time, sister, to return to the precepts of Liberius, of holy memory, that the holier the man, the more pleasing conversation should approach.” [448](#) Likewise, we see in the words of Epiphanius that: “Eustathius lead a legation to blessed Liberius, the bishop of Rome, together with many bishops.” [449](#) Basil also says in epistle 74 to the western bishops: “Certain things were proposed to us by the most holy Liberius.”

Next, Siricius, who was the third [Pope] after Liberius, declared in an epistle to Hymericus that Liberius was his predecessor of revered memory. How I ask, could these Fathers call Liberius most blessed after his death, if he had died in heresy? Therefore, only one doubt remains: whether in the

middle period, that is, in the very return from exile, he did something against the faith. And certainly, Sulpitius, Socrates, Sozomenus and Nicephorus show in the citations we have noted, that Liberius was always the same and never diminished in the constancy of the faith. On the other hand, Athanasius and Jerome obviously say the opposite; that being tired of exile he at length bent and subscribed to heresy. To which it can be added St. Hilary, who says against the Emperor Constantius: "You turned your war even to Rome, you snatched from there the bishop, and you are so miserable that I do not know whether you banished a man with greater impiety than you sent him back." [450](#) Ruffinus, however, affirms that he could not discover for certain whether Liberius had subscribed to heresy.

[451](#)

From such opinions there seems to us to be a second truer one. For Athanasius, Hilary and Jerome are both more ancient and important than the rest, and they relate the matter not as dubious but rather as certain and investigated. Besides, epistles written in the hand of Liberius can be read from the Vatican Library, which were written partly to the Emperor, and partly to the Oriental bishops; therein he sufficiently showed that he would acquiesce to the will of the Emperor. To this, unless we should affirm that Liberius at some time defected from the constancy that must be guarded in the faith, we are compelled to exclude Felix II, who managed the pontificate while Liberius was alive, from the number of the Pontiffs, although still, this very Felix was venerated by the Catholic Church as a Pope and martyr. Next, Sozomen [452](#) and Nicephorus [453](#) hint more obscurely that Liberius, in the Council of Sirmium, agreed with Valens and Ursacius (the Arians) and made peace with them, received back his see, aided even by letters of the same council. But although they would have these matters thus, still Liberius neither taught heresy nor was a heretic, but only sinned by an external act, just as St. Marcellinus, and, unless I am mistaken, he sinned less than Marcellinus.

St. Athanasius teaches that he was not truly a heretic, [454](#) when he says that Liberius was compelled against his will by the force of the rack to do what he did. Nor must it be thought to be truly his opinion which had been twisted from him by threats and terrors, especially given what he advanced when he was freely disposed; that he did not teach heresy can

easily be proved. It is gathered from the words of Athanasius as well as from the epistles of Liberius himself, that Liberius committed two faults: 1) That he subscribed to the condemnation of Athanasius; 2) That he had communicated with heretics; but in neither did he expressly violate the faith. For although heretics persecuted Athanasius for the faith, nevertheless, they pretended it was not due to the faith but morals, and Liberius consented to the condemnation of Athanasius on that basis, not on account of the faith. For equal reason he communicated with heretics, because they feigned that they were Catholics. In his epistles, Liberius says that he communicated with Oriental bishops because he discovered that their faith agreed with the Catholic faith, and was foreign to the Arian treachery.

Besides, Sozomen and Nicephorus [455](#) say that in the peace which Liberius made with the Arian bishops, nothing was demanded from him except that he would subscribe to the Confession of Sirmium published against Photius and the Confession of Antioch published in Enceniis. These confessions also do not have the word *homoouios*; still they are Catholic, and Hilary, in his book on councils, shows that they are Catholic. It happens that Liberius not only did not subscribe to the Arian confession, but even published a *Confession* before he left from Sirmium wherein he excommunicated those who denied that the Son is the same as the Father in substance, as well as in all other matters, as Nicephorus and Sozomen relate in the works we have cited. The reason he did this is because the Arians spread a false rumor that Liberius began to teach that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father.

Now someone will say: If that is so, then why does Jerome say that Liberius bent and subscribed to heresy in the end? I respond: Although Liberius did not expressly consent to heresy, still he was interpreted as having done so since he permitted Athanasius to be condemned, whom he knew suffered persecution for the sake of the faith, and communicated with Ursacius and Valens whom he knew were heretics although they feigned otherwise. Therefore, this is what Jerome meant.

The twelfth who is accused of error in faith by the heretics is Felix II, whom Tilman Hesh contends was an Arian [456](#) and attempts to show it from the testimony of St. Jerome, who in the catalogue of writers, on Acacius, says thus: “Acacius, whom they named (*monophthalmou*) because

he had one eye, was the bishop of Caesarea in Palestine. Under Constantius the Emperor he became famous because the Arian bishops constituted him Felix at Rome in place of Liberius.” But we respond that Felix was never an Arian, although he communicated with the Arians in the time in which he was not the true Pope. Still, when he began to be a true Pope, not only was he not an Arian but he even publicly detested the Arians, and on account of their persecution he received the crown of martyrdom from the Lord.

Therefore, it must be explained as briefly as it can be done, the history of the pontificate of Liberius and Felix, from which a marvelous providence of God will appear in the Apostolic see. After Liberius departed into exile on account of the Catholic Faith, the Roman Clergy swore never to admit another man as Pope while Liberius lived. Jerome witnesses that in his *Chronicle*, although his words have been transposed. These words "Who, being in exile, all the clergy swore, etc.," which are placed in the year 351 ought to be placed after these: "Liberius, the bishop of the Romans, is sent into exile," which are placed in the year 361.

Next, by a work of the Arians, and especially of Acacius, the bishop of Caesarea, Felix a Roman deacon was created a bishop in place of Liberius; on account of this good deed he freely communicated with him although he was not an Arian. Thus Ruffinus writes: "In Liberius' place, Felix his deacon was substituted by the heretics and he was not tainted by diversity of sect, but agreement of communion and ordination." [457](#) Theodoret says: "Liberius was succeeded by a faithful deacon named Felix, who, although he preserved the whole faith expressed in the Council of Nicaea, still he freely communicated with those who labored to subvert the same. And for that reason no one living at Rome wished to enter the Church if he was inside." [458](#)

Sozomen also writes the same thing. [459](#) Jerome does not disagree in his catalogue of writers on Acacius; for that term [Arian] is added to the name of Felix, and it seems to have crept in from somewhere else. Accordingly, the ancient manuscript codices do not have that term, as Marianus Victorius remarked on this place, nor does the translation into Greek made by St. Sophronius have it. Now what I find most important is that Freculph [460](#) and Ado of Vienna, [461](#) when referring to the whole sentence in this citation of Jerome, do not have the term "Arian".

Next, it is not at all credible that Jerome and Ruffinus could have such a discrepancy in their history, that one would deny something and the other affirms it. Even if Felix were an Arian (which still to this point is not proven) he did no harm to the Apostolic see. At that time Felix was an anti-pope, not a true and legitimate Pope, as two cannot be Pope together. The true Pope was still alive, namely Liberius. Wherefore (as we related from Theodoret above) no Catholic in Rome wanted to communicate with Felix at that time.

Next, two years after the fall of Liberius, concerning which we spoke above, then the Roman clergy abrogated Liberius from the pontifical dignity and conferred it upon Felix, whom they knew to be Catholic. From that time Felix began to be a true Pope. Although Liberius was not a heretic, still it was considered that, on account of the peace made with the Arians, that he was a heretic, and from that presumption his pontificate could rightly be abrogated. For men cannot be held to thoroughly search hearts; yet when they see one who is a heretic by his external works, then they judge simply and condemn him as a heretic. Jerome shows this in his *Chronicle*, when he says that many from the Roman clergy perjured themselves and went to Felix. They are said to have perjured themselves, because they did not keep the oath that they had taken to not receive another Pontiff.

Next, Felix, now a true Pope, noticing the danger to the Church and the faith, without a doubt inspired by God who did not desert his Church, not only receded from communication with the Arians, but even compelled a council and declared the Emperor Constantius, as well as the bishops Ursacius and Valens with whom Liberius had made peace, to be truly heretics. And for that reason, when Liberius returned to the city, Felix was ejected with his own by the Arians, and died not long after, whether beheaded, or consumed in labors. That is not known for certain. This, however, bears on the matter, that Felix, after the fall of Liberius, was a true Pope, and died for the Catholic faith, which is proved by these arguments.

First, Damasus (or whoever is the author of the *Pontifical*), clearly witnesses the life of Felix. St. Jerome appears to mean the same in the *Chronicle*, when he says on the Roman clergy: "After a year with Felix they were thrown out, because Liberius, conquered by the exhaustion of exile and subscribing to a heretical depravity, entered Rome as a victor." These words mean persecution moved against Felix, and it was moved by those

who favored the Arians. From that it follows that Felix himself suffered persecution for the Catholic faith.

Secondly, all ancient Martyrologies, both those laid down by Bede, Ado and Usuard, and even the manuscripts for the fourth day before the Kalends of August (29 July), place the memory of St. Felix II, Pope and Martyr, who declared Constantius a heretic. Add that St. Gregory I, both in his antiphonary and in his Sacramentary, places the whole ecclesiastical office that must be read for Mass in the day of St. Felix, Pope and martyr, on this same day, the fourth before the Kalends of August. Moreover, this Felix was a Roman Pontiff, and hence, the one about whom we are speaking, as Micrologus witnesses. [462](#) Therefore, since the Catholic Church has venerated this Felix for a thousand years as a Pope and martyr, he ought not be excluded from the number of Pontiffs, even if we could advance no other reason.

Thirdly, Pope Felix, the grandfather of St. Gregory, is called Felix IV by very ancient writers, such as by John the Deacon [463](#) and by Leo Hostiensis. [464](#) But he could not be fourth, unless the Felix about whom we are writing would have been the second. There were no more than two Felixes, apart from this our Felix, before the fourth. Therefore, a thousand years ago this Felix was held in the number of Pontiffs, and they did not make him in the number of the schismatics.

Fourthly, when there was some ambiguity in Rome in the year 1572 whether this St. Felix ought to be placed in the new Martyrology a marble box was discovered in the Basilica of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, with this inscription in the marble in ancient characters: "HIC IACET CORPVS SANCTI FELICIS PAPÆ, ET MARTYRIS, QUI CONSTANTIVM HÆRETICVM DAMNAVIT." [465](#)

At any rate, after the death of St. Felix, Liberius again reconciled the Roman clergy to himself, and was an outstanding Catholic prelate, as we showed above from the history of Socrates on the case of the Macedonians. For that reason in the consensus of all he began to sit legitimately again, and sat even to death. This is the reason why in the catalogue of Popes, some of the Fathers like Augustine [466](#) and Optatus, [467](#) could not place Felix, because clearly, the whole time of Felix was rolled into the pontificate of Liberius.

The thirteenth is a certain Pope (anti-Pope) Leo, whom several say succeeded Felix II and was plainly Arian; he died by the same type of death in which Arius perished, namely by the effusion of all his intestines, while at the toilet. Vincentius relates this, [468](#) as well as Conrad Halberstatensis in his Chronicle. The Centuriators do not reckon this improbable. [469](#)

There is no doubt that this Leo was an anti-pope. It is certain that Leo I was the one who sat in the time of the Council of Chalcedon; this is, around a hundred years after the times of Felix II. Next, all ancient writers, such as Jerome, Augustine, Optatus, Theodoret, Ruffinus, and still more recent writers, like Sigebert, Martin Polanus, Platina and everyone else, place Damasus after the death of Liberius and Felix.

Perhaps this false story arose from the imagined opinion of the heresy of Liberius, and the persecution against Catholics after Felix II was expelled. After the expulsion of Felix, leisurely men falsely reckoned that Liberius began to take on the nature of a fierce lion against Catholics and imagined an Arian Pope Leo sat after Felix II. [470](#) But these are numbered among the fables.

CHAPTER X: On Siricius, Innocent and Seven Other Popes

THE fourteenth Pope is Siricius, whom John Calvin accuses of error because in his letter to the Spanish he calls the union of spouses pollution. [471](#) But Calvin impudently lies, which is his custom. For Siricius did not appeal to the pollution of true and legitimate spouses; rather, their illicit unions where, union after carrying out a public penance again returned to the same union, on account of which they had done penance. No one ever did penance for a legitimate marriage.

The fifteenth is Pope Innocent I, whom the Centuriators, [472](#) in the life of Innocent, say gravely erred because he had commanded that a consecrated virgin, already veiled, who will have married or committed fornication, was not to be received to Penance while the man with whom she had sinned was alive. [473](#) It seems wicked, they say, that a woman doing penance ought not be absolved, unless first the one who seduced her should die. Likewise, in epistle 18, he wrote to Antiochenus at Alexandria that the baptisms of Arians were certainly valid, but that the Holy Ghost was not conferred through them, because they are separated from the Church. There, it seems, he would have it that the efficacy of holy baptism depends on the goodness of the minister, which is against the common doctrine of the Church. Moreover, he taught [474](#) that a man cannot be a priest who receives a widow as a wife, since the law of Moses commanded in Leviticus that a priest should receive a virgin as a wife, as if Christians were still held to the judicial laws of the Old Testament.

I respond: Firstly, Innocent wished to say that virgins should not be received in Penance who refused to be separated from the adulterer, except after his death, and this is most just. Those who persevere in their sins ought not be absolved by the Church.

I speak now to the second point. Innocent speaks in that place about those who were baptized or ordained by heretics, when they were polluted

by the same heresy. Those of this sort receive the Sacrament of baptism, or of ordination, but they do not receive the grace of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be present in heretics. And in ordination, not only do those ordained by heretics not receive grace, but they do not have the right to exercise Orders. The ordaining bishop loses that right through heresy, nor can he give what he does not have. [475](#)

Now I address the third argument. Innocent did mean that we are bound by the laws of the Jews; rather he wished to argue from a similar thing, or rather more, from a better thing in this mode. Priests in the Old Testament were held by divine precept not to marry a widow. Therefore, it is much more fitting that in the priesthood of the new law, the Church should require that they be not husbands of widows, on account of the excellence of Christian priesthood.

The sixteenth is Celestine I, whom Lorenzo Valla asserts was infected with the Nestorian heresy, in his *declamazione de falsa donazione Constantini*. But what Laurence says is false, since not only was it never recorded that Celestine was infected with this heresy, but he is the one who especially condemned that heresy, which is clear from Prosper of Aquitaine [476](#) as well as from the whole Council of Ephesus. Valla was deceived by the equivocation of the name. For there was a Celestine that was a Pelagian heretic who held certain things in common with the Nestorians.

The seventeenth is St. Leo I, who said that those women who think that their husbands are dead, or because they never return from captivity, marry another, do not sin; still, if the first should return, they are held to renew the first marriage. If however, the men do not wish to do so, they are not bound. [477](#) Here there are two errors: 1) That a woman would not sin if she married another man when she thinks the first husband is alive but simply never returned; 2) That a woman can remain with the second husband if the first refuses her. The Centuriators have much to say about this error. [478](#)

I respond: in neither case did Leo err. For when he says that a woman who marries would not sin while the prior husband is still alive, he spoke only of a woman who will marry because she supposes that the first husband is dead, and he eloquently explained the same thing. He said, in regard to a woman who will marry because she thinks her husband is never going to return, not that she sins nor that she does not, because he thought

the matter was known in itself, for without a doubt she sins. However, when he says a woman ought to return to the first husband, if he wishes it, consequently he wishes to be understood that a man ought to return to the woman, if she wills him, even if otherwise he does not want her. Husband and wife are equal in this matter. Therefore, if one of the spouses should wish to return to wedlock, the other is necessarily bound to obey: if, however, neither wishes to return, they can remain separated, in regard to the use of marriage, and this alone is what St. Leo permitted. From that it does not follow that a woman can remain with the second husband, for the same Leo clearly says in the same place that the first marriage is indissoluble, and necessarily must be reformed, while the second may be dissolved because it could not be a true marriage.

The eighteenth is Pope Gelasius. The Centuriators note that he has two opinions, which are erroneous according to Catholics. [479](#) One is in the book against Eutychus, where he says that true bread remains with the flesh of Christ in the Sacrament. The second we discover with Gratian that one cannot consume one part of the Sacrament of the Eucharist while not the other without great sacrilege. [480](#) Thus, either Gelasius erred in these two, or we err who teach and follow the contrary.

I respond to the first: That book is not of Pope Gelasius. It is either of Gennadius, who wrote a book of the same title to Pope Gelasius, or of Gelasius Caesar, the bishop, whom Jerome calls to mind near the end of this *Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers*. Accordingly, Pope Gelasius wrote five volumes against Eutychus, as Trithemius relates; but this one, however, is only one scanty book. Next, this author promises that he is going to gather the teachings of almost all the Fathers, on the Incarnation of the Lord, and when he adds fifteen Greek Fathers he only advances two Latin authors, Ambrose and Damasus. Yet he omits Cyprian, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Innocent, Leo, Prosper, and the like, whom Pope Gelasius never omitted; nay more, nor did any Latin author do so. Therefore, it seems manifest that this author was Greek and not Latin. To the second, I say that Gelasius speaks in that canon only on the priest offering the sacrifice, who cannot take only one species without sacrilege, because he would render an imperfect sacrifice.

The nineteenth is Pope Anastasius II, who is accused of three errors. Firstly, because he communicated with Photinus, who had communicated

with the heretic Acacius without a council of bishops, priests and clergy of the whole Church. Secondly, because he wanted to secretly recall Acacius, whom Felix and Pope Gelasius had condemned. Thirdly, because he approved baptism and orders confirmed by the same Acacius; on account of such errors and sins the same Anastasius, after a divinely constituted plague had set in, immediately died. Not only does the author of the *Pontificalis* write these things in the life of this Anastasius, whose account Tilman Hesh followed, [481](#) but even Gratian, [482](#) and the Centuriators. [483](#)

I respond: It is quite false that Anastasius wished to recall Acacius. This is certain from Evagrius [484](#) and from Nicephorus [485](#) as well as Liberatus. Acacius died in the time of Pope Felix, from whom Anastasius was third. How, therefore, did Anastasius wish to recall someone to his see who had long been dead? But, some would say, he at least wished to restore his name. On the other hand, an epistle of this Pope Anastasius is extant, sent to the emperor by the same name, in which he asks the Emperor to command the name of Acacius be held in silence in the Church, seeing that he had been most justly condemned by his predecessor Pope Felix. What Gratian says, namely, that Anastasius erred in this epistle because he wanted the Sacraments of baptism and order which Acacius had conferred to be held as valid, [486](#) does not show Anastasius a heretic, but Gratian inexperienced. Who does not know that Catholics that are baptized by heretics are truly baptized, and likewise those who are ordained by them are truly ordained, even when the ordaining bishop was a heretic and remained so, at least in regard to the [Sacramental] character?

Now, that part on Photinus is probably a lie, just as the revocation of Acacius, but even if it were true, would Anastasius not be Catholic for that reason? Or is it not lawful for the Supreme Pontiff to absolve one excommunicated without a council of all bishops, priests, and clerics of the whole Church? Now the matter which they add, that Pope Anastasius immediately died by a heaven sent plague, seems to arise for the reason that the heretical emperor Anastasius died from being struck by lightning at the same time, as the historians relate in his life. [487](#) Otherwise it is without doubt a fable.

The twentieth Pope is Vigilius. Liberatus relates in chapter 22 of his *Breviary* that Vigilius wrote an epistle to Theodora the Empress and other

heretics, whereby he confirmed their heresy and declared anathema on those who confessed that there are two natures in Christ.

I respond: Many reckon that heretics corrupted this citation of Liberatus, for the reason that it seems contrary to what is said in the *Pontifical*. But since no vestige of corruption appears in the book of Liberatus, and really, the relation is not opposed to that of the *Pontifical*, another response must be given. Therefore, I say that Vigilius wrote that epistle, and condemned the Catholic faith, at least from exterior profession, but this does nothing to obstruct our case. For he did that when Pope Sylverius was still living and at that time Vigilius was not Pope, but an anti-Pope. For two men cannot be true Popes at the same time, and it was certain then to all that Sylverius was the true Pope, although he abided in exile.

It must be known, that Anthemius, the heretic, was deposed from the Episcopate of Constantinople by Pope Agapetus. Then the empress [Theodora] sought from Sylverius, the successor of Agapetus, that he would restore Anthemius. Yet when he refused, Vigilius, then an archdeacon, promised the empress that he would restore Anthemius, if he could be made Roman Pontiff: immediately, by the command of the empress, Belisarius, his general, expelled Saint Sylverius from his own see and sent him into exile, and created Vigilius Pope, or, rather, an antipope. In that period it would be no marvel if he erred in faith, and could even plainly be a heretic. Still, he did not even define something against the faith as Pope, nor was he a heretic in spirit. Accordingly, he wrote that nefarious epistle, and it was unworthy of a Christian man; still, he did not openly condemn the Catholic faith in it, nor manifest a heretical spirit, but secretly, on account of the lust for control, just as Liberatus says in the aforementioned citation, which also appears from the epistle of Vigilius himself. He writes that they should be careful lest anyone should see that epistle, and that all should be secret for a time. Vigilius then was upon the very narrow straights that his ambition had thrown him. For if he openly professed heresy, he would fear the Romans, who were never seen to suffer a heretic to sit in the chair of Peter; if, on the other hand, he would profess the Catholic faith, he feared the heretical Empress, whose work had secured for him the pontificate. Therefore, he devised the plan that he would be a Catholic at Rome, and meanwhile through, his letters feign that he was a heretic to the emperor.

It happened a little afterward, that Sylverius died and Vigilius, who to that point sat in schism, now began to be the sole and legitimate Pontiff for

certain through the confirmation and reception by the clergy and the Roman people.

From this time neither error nor feigning of error was discovered in Vigilius, but rather, supreme constancy in the faith even to death, as it shall appear. For he received with the pontificate the strength of faith and he was changed from a weak chaff into the most solid rock. When the Empress Theodora, having relied upon the secret letters as well as the promise of Vigilius, asked from him that he would restore the aforementioned Patriarch Anthemius, as he had promised, he wrote back that he had promised rashly and gravely sinned in that promise. Therefore, he could not nor would fulfill what he had promised, lest he would add sins to sins. For that reason, when the Empress became angry, he was sent into exile, and miserably tortured even to death. That much is not only written in the *Pontifical*, but Paul the Deacon also annotated it in the *Life of Justinian*, as well as Aimonius. [488](#)

Even the Centuriators themselves, [489](#) as well as the same Liberatus who was cited earlier, say that Vigilius was later miserably afflicted by the adherents of that very heresy which he had secretly fostered in the beginning.

Next, Vigilius, after the death of Sylverius, was a true and holy Pontiff, as all witness who lived in those times and wrote something on him. Pope Gregory I says: “The memory of Pope Vigilius must be recalled, constituted in the royal city, who promulgated the sentence of condemnation against Theodora, then the empress.” [490](#) Cassiodorus says: “It is certain that Origen was condemned at that time by Blessed Pope Vigilius.” [491](#) Arator wrote a preface to the Apostolic Acts, which he dedicated to Pope Vigilius, and begins thus: “To the holy, most blessed, Apostolic, Pope Vigilius, first of all priests in the whole world.” Next, it is certain from Evagrius that the Fifth General Council was confirmed by Vigilius, in which that heresy that Theodora favored and which the adversaries of Vigilius accused him of adhering to, was condemned. [492](#)

It could be said that the epistle of Vigilius, which Liberatus calls to mind, was fabricated by heretics. Liberatus, moreover, may have believed false rumors that the heretics had spread. That the heretics fabricated a certain epistle in the name of Pope Vigilius to Theodora and Justinian can be recognized by certain indications in the Sixth Council, action 14; but

whatever the case on this, it is enough for us that when he was a true Pope, he made no error in faith.

The twenty-first is St. Gregory I. Durandus accused him of error because in an epistle [493](#) he permitted priests to confer the Sacrament of Confirmation, which is fitting for bishops alone to confer by divine law. On account of this citation of Gregory, Adrian asserts that the Pope can err in defining dogmas of faith. [494](#)

I respond: Firstly, it is not St. Gregory, but rather Durandus and Adrian who have erred. The Council of Florence, in the *Instructione Armenorum*, and the Council of Trent, in the last canon of its 7th Session, teach that the ordinary minister of Confirmation is the bishop. Wherein it follows that extraordinarily, even a non-bishop can be the minister of this Sacrament. Next, Gregory did not publish some decree on the matter, but only conceded to certain priests, that in the absence of the bishops, they may confirm. Hence, if Gregory erred in this matter, it was not of doctrine but an error of example or fact. There is another error which is attributed to St. Gregory but falsely, and we will speak on it below when we treat on Gregory III.

The twenty-second is Boniface V, whom the Centuriators grievously condemn [495](#) because he taught that Christ redeemed us only from original sin. [496](#) I respond: The Centuriators added that term *only* on their own. For Boniface says: “Therefore, hasten to acknowledge him, who created you, who breathed the breath of life into you, who sent his only-begotten son for your redemption, so that he would deliver you from original sin.” The reason why he did not call to mind other sins is because original sin is the principal one, and it was for the purpose of destroying it that Christ principally died. Wherefore, in John I we read: “Behold the Lamb of God, behold he who takes away the sins of the world. In Greek: “*Tēn amartian tou kosmou*” that is, the sin of the world; this is original sin, because it alone is common to the whole world. For many have no other sin, such as all children.

CHAPTER XI: On Honorius I.

THE TWENTY-THIRD is Honorius I. Nilos Cabásilas contends that he was a Monothelite heretic in his book on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. The Centuriators assert the same thing and place him among manifest heretics. [497](#) Not just heretics, but even several Catholics contend Honorius was a heretic, such as Melchior Cano.

[498](#) There are six arguments that they bring to the fore.

1) From the epistles of Honorius himself, for there are extant two epistles of Honorius to Servius; one in the Sixth Council, action 12, the other the same, act 13. Furthermore, they say that in each Honorius approves the doctrine of Servius, the leader of the Monothelites, and bids it not to be said, that Christ had two wills, or operations [*operationes*].

2) From the Sixth Council, act 13, where Honorius was condemned as a heretic and his letters were burned, and in the following acts the condemnation was repeated by all.

3) From the Seventh Council, last act, where the whole Council declared anathema to Honorius, Sergius, Cyril and the other Monothelites, and repeated the same in an epistle which it wrote to all clerics.

4) From the Eighth Council, act 7, where the letter of the Roman Council under Pope Adrian II was read and approved. In that letter the Pope asserts with the Council that Honorius was judged after his death by the Sixth Council, because he had been accused of heresy.

5) From the epistle of Pope Agatho, who in a letter to the Emperor Constantius (which is contained in the 4th act of the Sixth Council), he declares Anathema to Honorius, just as to the Monothelites.

6) From Leo II, who in an epistle to the same emperor, which is contained at the end of the council, the same Honorius is cursed; just as one who had contaminated the Apostolic See with heresy.

7) From various Greek and Latin writers who witness that Honorius was a heretic. Thrasius, the bishop of Constantinople, asserts this, in an epistle to the Patriarchs, which is contained in act. 3 of the Seventh Council. Likewise Epiphanius, a Catholic deacon, in a disputation with a heretic

named Gregory, which is contained in act 6 of the Seventh Council, volume 2. Psellus relates it in a poem about the Seventh Council, as does Bede, [499](#) and it is in the *Liber Pontificalis* concerning the life of Leo II.

Yet several wrote on behalf of Honorius: Albert Pighius, [500](#) Cardinal Hosius [501](#) and Onufrius in an annotation to Platina in the life of Honorius. Their reasoning is much more efficacious than of the other side, as will be clear in the answers to the arguments.

To the first: I respond in two ways. It is possible that these two epistles were fabricated and inserted into the general council by heretics. Certainly one should not say this rashly, yet in this matter it is certain that in the Fifth Council heretics inserted fictitious epistles of the Roman Pope Vigilius, as well as Mennas, the Patriarch of Constantinople. That was detected in the Sixth Council, [502](#) while the acts of the Fifth Council were re-read. They discovered three or four groups of things inserted and placed in these epistles by heretics. What wonder would it be if they carried out the same plans in the Sixth Council?

To the second I say, no error is contained in these epistles of Honorius. For Honorius confesses in these epistles what pertains to the matter of two wills and operations in Christ, and he only forbids the name of one or two wills, which then were unheard of, and he did it with prudent counsel. That he confessed the matter itself is clear from the words of the second epistle: “We ought to confess both natures in the one Christ, joined in a natural unity, working in harmony with the other, and also confess operations. And certainly the divine operation, which is of God, and the human operation, which is of God, carrying it out not in division, nor confusion, informing the other but not changing the nature of God into man, nor the human into God, but confessing the different natures whole, etc.” This confession is very Catholic, and altogether destroys the Monothelite heresy.

Moreover it can be shown that Honorius acted with great prudence when he forbade the names of one or two operations. For then it was the beginning of this heresy, and nothing on these terms was yet defined by the Church. Then, Cyrus of Alexandria began first to preach one operation in Christ, while conversely Sophronius of Jerusalem opposed himself to Cyrus, preaching two operations in Christ. Cyrus related this contention both to Sergius of Constantinople and to Honorius of Rome. Therefore,

Honorius, fearing that which later would happen, wanted to conciliate each opinion, and at the same time abolish the matter of scandal and contention from sight. He acted to prevent this contention from becoming a serious schism, and at the same time he saw the faith would be preserved without these terms. Therefore, he wrote in the first epistle that they ought to abstain from the term “one operation,” lest we would seem to place one nature in Christ with the followers of Eutychus, and again from the term of two operations, lest we seem to place two persons in Christ with Nestorius. “Let no one, being offended by the term ‘of two operations’ think by some madness that we agree with the Nestorian sects, or certainly if again we sensed that one operation must be affirmed, that we would be reckoned by itching ears to confess the foolish madness of the Monophysites.”

In the second epistle, while teaching the manner of speaking and reconciling the opinions: “Therefore, bearing the scandal of a novel invention, it is not fitting for us to preach defining one or two operations; but for one which they mean by ‘operation,’ it is fitting for us to confess there is one operator, Christ the Lord, truthfully in each nature; and for two operations, after the term of twin operations has been removed, or rather more of two natures, that is, of divinity and flesh taken in one person of the only begotten Son of God the Father unconfusedly, indivisibly, and also inconvertibly to preach his proper workers with us.” Certainly, this can only be praised.

Then they say, however, that a little below he clearly preaches only one will in these words: “Wherefore, we profess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ.” I respond: In that place, Honorius spoke only on the human nature, and meant that in the man, Christ, there were not two wills opposing each other, one of the flesh and the other of the spirit; but only one, namely the spirit. For the flesh in Christ desired absolutely nothing against reason. Moreover, this is the mind of Honorius, and that is plain from the reason that he gave. Thus he says: “Wherefore, we affirm one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, because certainly our nature was assumed by the divinity there is no fault, certainly that which had created sin, not that which was damaged after sin.” This reasoning is null, if it is advanced to prove in Christ, God and man, there is only one will; it is very efficacious if thence it must be proved that in Christ the man there were not contrary wills of the flesh and spirit. That contrariety is born from sin, but Christ has a human nature without sin.

Next, because someone could have objected with the citations of the Gospel, “I have not come to do my will,” and “Not what I will, but what you will,” where Christ seems, as a man, to have contrary wills, indeed one wicked, whereby it wished not to suffer; and the other good, whereby it did not wish to fulfill the first will, but the contrary which was conformed to the will of God. Honorius responds a little later: “It is written, ‘I have not come to do my will, but the will of Him who sent me,’ and ‘Not what I will, but what you will Father’ and other things of this sort. They are not of a different will, but taken up from the dispensation of humanity. This was said on account of us, to whom he gave an example, in order that we might follow in his footsteps, the pious teacher imbuing his students, that each one of us should not do his own will, but rather more that he would prefer the will of the Lord in all things.” In other words, Christ did not have contrary wills, so that it would be fitting for him to conquer and mortify one. Instead he so spoke as if he had contrary wills, that he would teach us to mortify our own will, which often strives to rebel against God.

St. Maximus, who lived in the time of Honorius, confirms this with serious testimony. He wrote a dialogue against Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, which is still in the Vatican Library. In that *Dialogue* he introduces Pyrrhus the heretic, advancing in front of him the testimony of Honorius, then he responds that Honorius was always Catholic, and proves it with another source, from the testimony of the secretary of Honorius himself, who wrote those epistles dictated by Honorius, and who was then still living, and said that. Moreover the Secretary witnesses the mind of Honorius was never to deny two wills in Christ, and whenever it seems to deny two wills, it must be understood on two contrary and opposed wills in the same human nature, which is discovered in us from sin, but was not in Christ. St. Maximus records these very words:

PYRRHUS: What do you have whereby you could respond about Honorius, who wrote in his letters to Sergius in previous times that he clearly professed one will in our Lord Jesus Christ?

MAXIMUS: I reverence each of these letters, and a more certain interpretation must be given. Did not his scribe, who wrote those epistles in the name of Honorius, who still lives, say that he adorned the West with the splendor of every virtue and discipline in religion; or the

citizens of Constantinople, who will have nothing but what is pleasing to them?

PYRRHUS: I reverence what he wrote.

MAXIMUS: But he [the secretary] wrote to Emperor Constantius about that epistle, at the command of Pope John, saying “We rightly said one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, it must not be taken up as if it spoke on two wills of divine and human nature, but only of one in human nature.” Since Sergius wrote to preach that there were two particular contrary wills of Christ, we wrote back that Christ did not have two contrary wills.

Furthermore, in the whole epistle, Honorius contends it must not be said that in Christ as God and man there is one or two wills, how did he so forget himself that he would then clearly affirm one will? Therefore, he did not say there is one for God and man, but one for Christ as man alone, as the words which follow and the secretary witness. Therefore, we hold that there is no error in these epistles.

I say to the second: without a doubt, the name of Honorius was inserted among those who are condemned by the Sixth Council by rivals of the Roman Church, and likewise whatever else is said against him. I prove this, a) because Anastasius the Librarian witnesses this in his history drawn from Theophanus the Isaurian, a Greek; and b) it was nearly an ordinary custom of the Greeks to corrupt books. For (as we said) in the Sixth Council itself, act 12 and 14, many corruptions were discovered made by heretics in the Fifth Council. And Pope Leo [503](#) sought from the Greeks why they had corrupted his epistle to Flavian even though he was still living? Pope Gregory asserted that at Constantinople they had corrupted the Council of Chalcedon, and he suspected the same about Ephesus. [504](#) And he adds that the codices of the Romans by far had greater veracity than those of the Greeks: “Because the Romans, just as they do not have frauds, so also they do not have impostures.”

Next, Nicholas I, in his epistle to Michael, referring the emperor to the epistle of Adrian I, said: “If still, it has not been falsified in the hands of the church of Constantinople from the custom of the Greeks, but is just as it was sent from the Apostolic See, so far it will have been preserved.” He did not say this without cause, for the things he alleges in the epistle to Photius

from the epistle of Adrian to Tharasius, are not contained in that epistle, as it is read in the Seventh Council. Therefore the Greeks cut out that citation, because it took action against the honor of Tharasius. Therefore, if the Greeks corrupted the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Seventh Council, would anyone be surprised if they had corrupted the Sixth also? Especially since it is certain that a little after the Sixth Council concluded, many bishops again went up to Constantinople and published the canons in Trullo; the purpose of the said bishops seems to have been nothing other than to revile and condemn the Roman Church.

Thirdly, the council could not condemn Honorius as a heretic, unless it opposed the epistle of St. Agatho, nay, more even itself; plainly it asserts the contrary. For Pope Agatho in Epistle I to the Emperor, which was read in that very council (sess. 4), says: "This is the rule of the true faith, which vigorously remains steadfast in good times as well as bad. This spiritual mother defended the affairs of your most peaceful empire, namely, the Apostolic Church of Christ, which through the grace of almighty God is proved never to have erred from the course of apostolic tradition, nor succumbed to the depravities of novel heretics. From the beginning of the Christian faith she has secured by means of the authoritative princes of the Apostles of Christ, with the unimpaired goal remaining in her power, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Savior himself, which was confessed by the prince of the disciples in the holy Gospels, Peter, saying 'Peter, behold, Satan has asked to sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith shall not fail, and thou, when thou has been converted, strengthen thy brethren.' Let your tranquil mercy consider that the Lord and Savior of all, whose faith it is, who promised the faith of Peter was not going to fail, admonished him to strengthen his brethren, which the Apostolic Pontiffs, the predecessors of my scanty [Pontificate] have always done, and which has been acknowledged by all."

Here, note that Agatho not only says the faith in the see of Peter did not fail, nor could fail, and hence the Pope cannot, as Pope, settle something against the faith; but even that all his predecessors, one of which is Honorius, always resisted heresies and strengthened the brethren in faith. And further on, after Agatho enumerated the Monothelite heretics, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter and Theodore, he said: "Hence, the holy Church of God must be delivered and freed from the supreme endeavors and errors of such teachers, in order that the evangelical and apostolic

rectitude of the Orthodox faith, which was founded on the firm rock of this Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles and of the Church, which remains inviolate by his grace and protection from every error, every number of prelates, clergy and people will confess and preach with us.” The whole council in the eighth action, and in the 18th approved this epistle, where the Fathers not only said that Agatho spoke, but that St. Peter spoke through Agatho.

Therefore, from these testimonies I argue: If Honorius was a Monothelite heretic, then how could Agatho, disputing in the face of this very heresy, write that none of his predecessors ever erred? And when the other churches were stained by the errors of their Prelates, only the Roman Church remained intact? Then, if the council affirmed that Peter spoke through Agatho, and said: “the Roman Pontiffs always confirmed their brethren in faith, and never succumbed to heresy,” with what temerity would the same Council in nearly each action say anathema to the heretic Honorius? Therefore it must be that either the council was falsified; or the epistle of Agatho, or that the council is opposed with itself and with Agatho. Now, no one has ever asserted this last one, not even the heretics; on the second there was never any suspicion; therefore it is necessary to hold the first.

Nilos responds to this last argument, but in vain: “Perchance Agatho was moved, both from the fact that the reasoning of the question demanded, as often happens, that he should so write; and because really that Church had erred from the truth more rarely.”

But the reasoning of the question certainly demanded that he would say something on his authority, and on the praises of his predecessors. But would it demand that he would impudently lie? Would it not also have been a very impudent lie for Agatho to say that all his predecessors always resisted heresy, if Honorius, whom he was speaking about, was contaminated with that heresy? It is not enough to say that the Roman Church erred more rarely in order to maintain that it had truly never erred. But let us listen to the rest. Nilos continues: “Otherwise, if this were true, simply and without exception (that no Roman Pontiff erred), how would that agree with what [Scripture] says; ‘All have sinned and we are all guilty; there is not one who does good, not even one?’”

Certainly outstanding reasoning, as if David spoke on faith and not on morals. The Psalmist does not say that there is not one who believes rightly,

rather “There is not one who does good,” and James says: “For we all have offended in many things.” Otherwise, if he meant on faith, it would follow that even Paul, and John and all the Apostles could err, even after the reception of the Holy Spirit.

Nilos continues: “It may be that this is rightly said that when Agatho spoke, he meant that in past times the Roman Church did not err, but not that it would be impossible to err in the future.” But Honorius, O good Nilos, was in past times. He preceded Agatho by many years. Moreover, did not Agatho speak on the future, when he said that the faith in the See of Peter *would* never fail?

Lastly, Nilos adds: “Agatho certainly wrote these things before the Sixth Council, for then he was not sufficiently acquainted with the matters on which the Sixth Council treated. It would be no great wonder if that holy council examined matters which one man alone could not sufficiently discern.”

But if this is so, then Agatho erred from ignorance. Yet why did the whole council in the 8th and 18th action approve that epistle, as though it were written by St. Peter? Why is this anything else than to say the whole council either approved error, or is clearly opposed to itself? I will pass over the fact that no one better understood the doctrines of Honorius than Agatho, since the matter is made plain by John IV. It was more often examined by Theodore, Martin and other predecessors of Agatho, the successors of Honorius.

Fourthly, it is proved from the epistle of Nicholas I to the Emperor Michael, where Nicholas says on the Roman Pontiffs: “For at no time has even a wicked rumor ever defiled us; and when perverse things are discerned with the wise, do they not dispute them all the more?” But how is this true, if in a public, celebrated and well attended general council, it was so often acclaimed ‘anathema to the heretic Honorius’?

Fifthly, it is proved because it is either necessary to say that this council, where it condemns Honorius, was corrupted by rivals, or it is fitting to assert this same council labored under intolerable error and impudence; but this second has never been said even by heretics, therefore the first must be said. Moreover, the council could not condemn Honorius for a heretic without intolerable impudence and error, since it is certain it had no other indication of the “heresy” of Honorius except from his epistles to Sergius, where Honorius forbids one or two operations to be said in Christ. But those

epistles very clearly witness that Honorius considered and taught two operations in Christ and he only wished for Sergius to abstain from the use of those words “one”, or “two” to remove scandal and pacify contention. Moreover, he cannot be condemned as a heretic when he confessed the matter itself, although he thought the name could be kept silent for a just cause, especially before a definition of the Church. Otherwise, St. Jerome could now be condemned as a heretic because in his epistle to Damasus he sensed it must not be said in God there are three hypostases, the contrary of which the Church later defined, and not only once.

Lastly, it happens that a well-attended Roman Council (which was celebrated by Pope St. Martin I, a Pope and a martyr, before the Sixth Council), took up the case of the Monothelites. Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus and Paulus were condemned by name, but no mention was made of Honorius. This cannot be attributed to human respect, since these bishops were very holy men, and especially St. Martin, who presided over the council. Much less can it be attributed to ignorance or forgetfulness. Who would better know the deeds of their successors? Therefore, if the Roman Council did not condemn Honorius, which had his epistles in its own hand as well as living witnesses of his words and deeds, how credible is it that the Sixth Council would do it from his epistles alone?

What if someone were brought in that could not believe that the Sixth Council would be corrupted; he could look to another solution, which is in Juan de Torquemada. [505](#) He teaches that the Fathers of the Sixth Council condemned Honorius but from false information, and hence erred in that judgment. Although a legitimate general council could not err in defining dogmas of faith (and the Sixth Council did not), still it could err in questions of fact. Therefore, we can safely say that those Fathers were deceived by false rumors and did not understand the epistles of Honorius, and wrongly enumerated Honorius with the heretics.

You will say: Therefore, you understand the epistles of Honorius better than so many Fathers? I respond: Certainly not me, but by John IV, Martin I, Agatho and Nicholas I, the Supreme Pontiffs, and by the Roman Council gathered under Pope Martin, these epistles were better understood than by the Greeks in the Sixth Council.

Why, therefore, you will ask, did the legates of Agatho not protest when Honorius was condemned? I respond: It would have been done to avoid a

greater evil. The legates feared if they would have protested that a definition of right faith would be impeded, and a schism which had endured for sixty years, would not be healed. For in that council many patriarchs were condemned, of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch, whose successors would not easily have acquiesced unless also Honorius were condemned, who had been accused together with them. And thus the second argument.

Now I respond to the third: The Fathers of the Seventh Council followed the Sixth, and only repeated what had been read in it. Hence they were deceived from the Sixth Council, which was either corrupted or had condemned Honorius in error.

To the fourth I respond: Adrian, with the Roman Council, did not clearly say that Honorius was a heretic, but only that anathema was said to him by the Orientals, because he had been accused of heresy. There it seems Adrian, on that account, had said Honorius was anathematized by the Oriental bishops, because he knew he was not anathematized by the Western bishops, that is by the Council of St. Martin. Moreover, Adrian added that even in the case of Honorius, the Eastern bishops would not have dared to pass judgment on Honorius unless the Roman See had already given its consent, because he knew the legates of Agatho consented to the condemnation of Honorius, and indeed we say this if the acts of the Sixth Council are to be defended as if they are intact; if we were to say they were corrupted, then the response will be that Adrian was deceived by those corrupted acts of the Sixth Council.

You might say: But certainly these Councils believed that the Pope could err. I respond: Those Fathers only believed that the Pope could err as a private man, which is a probable opinion, although the contrary seems more probable to us. That is all that Honorius is accused of, that he fostered heresy in *private letters*.

To the fifth I say: Melchior Cano errs twice in this argument. First, when he says Agatho said anathema to Honorius; it is not discovered in his epistles. But Cano seems to have been deceived by the work *Summa Conciliorum*, for the author of that work added the name of Honorius against the faith of those epistles which are contained whole in the second volume of councils. Next, when he says this epistle of Agatho was written to the Sixth Council. Both epistles were not written to the council, but to the emperor.

To the sixth argument I say: The same men who corrupted the Sixth Council also corrupted the epistle of Leo. If that epistle were to be thought of as some part of the council, it is fashioned with that council. Or else Leo followed the judgment of the legates of Agatho, lest he would disturb a business that was already settled. But we are not held anymore to follow one Leo than so many other Popes, especially in a question of fact, which does not pertain to the faith.

To the seventh argument: I object authors to authors, many to a few, and more ancient to more recent; for in the first place, St. Maximus (who lived in the time of Honorius), in the *Dialogue against Pyrrhus*, as well as Theophanes the Isaurian in his history which Onuphrius and Emanuel Calleca cite in a book (which he wrote for the Latins against the Greeks), always witnesses the fact that Honorius was Catholic. Next, even Photius, a Greek, and hostile to the Roman Church, in a book on the seven councils, where he comes to the Sixth Council, says that those who were condemned were Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, but he says no such thing of Honorius. Likewise, Zonaras, in his life of Constantine IV, relating the names of those condemned in the Sixth Council, omits Honorius, just as Paul the Deacon in the life of the same Constantine IV. Lastly, almost all Latin historians such as Bede, Anastasius the Librarian, Blondus [506](#) Nauclerus, Sabellicus, Platina and others have it that Honorius was a Catholic and holy Pope.

I have added even Bede, even if Melchior Cano refused. I do not doubt whether he thought the same thing, although in his book *de sex ætatibus*, the name of Honorius crept in among those who were condemned in the Sixth Council. It seems some scribe added the name of Honorius in the book of Bede, for the reason that in the Sixth Council everywhere he is discovered with the names of Cyrus, Sergius etc. That Bede held Honorius for a holy man, even after his death, is clear from book 2 of his *History of the English People*, chapters 17-19, where he speaks often of Honorius as the best of shepherds. [507](#)

CHAPTER XII: On Seven Other Popes.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH Roman Pontiff who is accused of error is St. Martin I, whom the Centuriators [508](#) accuse because he taught that forgiveness is not to be given to priests or deacons after their ordination for sins, [509](#) which seems to be a species of Novatianism.

I respond: Martin did not speak on forgiveness of sins, but on the restitution to their sacred ministries. He wished priests and deacons who grievously sinned to be deposed from their state, and if they should come to their senses and seek forgiveness, they should be absolved from their sins, but never restored to their state, which is what all the Fathers teach.

The twenty-fifth is Pope Gregory III, whom the Centuriators accuse, 1) that in an epistle to St. Boniface, he commanded all of those who had been ordained by anyone apart from those whom the Roman Pontiff had sent to be consecrated again. [510](#) But this is clearly a lie. Gregory only commanded those that were not ordained by true bishops must be consecrated again.

2) They accuse him, in another epistle to St. Boniface, of permitting a man to marry another woman, if, on account of some disease, his own wife is not well enough to render the marriage debt. Gratian also records this. [511](#) St. Gregory the Great is also accused of the same error by several, on account of his epistle to Augustine of Canterbury, in which the same words are found.

I respond: In the first place, one must marvel why the Lutherans would hold this for an error, since Luther taught the same thing, as John Cochläus shows. [512](#) Next, I say that Gregory did not speak on any sort of imbecility, but on perpetual and natural impotence, through which a woman is unsuitable for marriage. Such marriages, if they were contracted from error, are not reckoned to be marriages and they are dissolved in the

judgment of the Church as we see it in the decretals, [513](#) and the Glossa responds in like manner. [514](#)

But against this, Gregory seems to judge that the first was a true matrimony, and not dissolved as much as added according to it. He writes that a man ought not to take away the subsidy from the first wife; that is, he ought to still support and sustain her as a wife. Therefore, it could also be said with the same Glossa, [515](#) that the Pope spoke on each infirmity, but not to concede another spouse as though it were just, but rather less bad. It seems less bad that someone should have one concubine, than that he should consort with many harlots. Or, certainly, the Pontiff fell from ignorance. But we do not deny that it could happen to the Popes when they do not define something as *de fide*, but only declare an opinion to others. Gregory seems to have done this in this citation. Moreover, it must be noted that this opinion was not of Gregory I, but only of this Gregory III, since it is not discovered among the works of St. Gregory, but only in the volumes of councils. There, the Roman Council, on the prohibited degrees in regards to matrimony, is attributed to Gregory I and III, when still really it could not be so unless it originated from Gregory III. Such is clear from names of the emperors who appear in the beginning and end of the council.

The twenty-sixth is Nicholas I, whom several condemn, because he taught that baptism conferred in the name of Christ, without expression of the three persons, was valid. [516](#) That is contrary not only to the evangelical institution, but even to the decrees of other Popes, namely, of Pelagius and Zachary, who condemned the baptism of those who are only baptized in the name of Christ and not expressly in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and is clear in the same place. [517](#) Nor can the response be given that in the time of Nicholas, it was still not defined whether baptism was invalid if conferred in the name of Christ, for that was defined in the English Council and confirmed by Pope Zachary who preceded Nicholas. [518](#)

I respond: Nicholas was not defining a question on faith when he spoke; rather, he only expressed his opinion in passing as a private teacher. For what he intended to teach in that canon was not on the form of baptism, but only on the minister concerning which he had been asked. Therefore, after

he responded and defined that baptism was valid, even if given by a Jew or a pagan, which the question was especially about, he added in passing that baptism is valid whether it is given in the name of the three persons or in the name of Christ alone. In this he followed the opinion of Ambrose as he says himself. [519](#) Still, in my judgment, this opinion is false, but not heretical. There is no certain definition of the Church that is discovered on this affair, and various opinions are discovered among the Fathers.

Now those canons of Pelagius and Zachary also do not obstruct the case. In the first place, Pelagius did not define anything, but in his epistle to Gaudentius explains his opinion only as a teacher. Moreover, the canon of Zachary is exceedingly suspect. In the first place, Gratian cites the epistle of Zachary to Boniface, when he places this canon, but such an opinion is not discovered in the epistles of Zachary to Boniface, which are extant in the volumes of councils.

Next, Bede makes no mention of this English council in his history, where he always makes mention of other English councils. Nay more, Bede himself follows the contrary opinion, [520](#) as he approves the opinion of Ambrose on baptism in the name of Christ. Still, one could not ignore a decree of an English council, if it were real, which Zachary mentions, since he lived in the same time and still outlived Zachary. It does not seem at all believable that he would wish to contradict a council celebrated in his own country and confirmed by the Apostolic See.

Yet, if we admit the authority of this council and Zachary, we can respond twofold. Firstly, with St. Peter Lombard that in this council it was only defined that baptism was not valid without the invocation of the three persons. Still, it was not defined whether the three persons ought to be named explicitly, and hence this canon is not opposed to the opinion of Ambrose and of Nicholas, who taught that it sufficed to implicitly name the three persons in the one name of Christ. [521](#) St. Bernard also understood that canon of the council in this manner [522](#) as well as Hugh of St. Victor and all other teachers of that age, who taught, notwithstanding the canon of the English Council, that baptism in the name of Christ was valid.

It can be said secondly, that the English Council was not truly and properly approved by the Apostolic See, and therefore does not make the matter *de fide*. Zachary certainly praised the English Council, and cited its

decrees for his proposition; still, he did not properly approve it as Pope and with the intention of confirming the acts of the Council. It is one thing for the Pope to confirm the decrees of Councils in earnest, and another to commend something that other [Councils] proposed.

The twenty-seventh Pope is Stephen VI, who can be joined with the twenty eighth Pope accused of error, Sergius III. It is certain from Platina and others, that Stephen invalidated the acts of Pope Formosus, his predecessor, and commanded those ordained by him to be ordained again. Hence he thought that the Sacrament depended upon the virtue of the minister, which is a manifest error in faith. For that reason, Pope John IX afterward invalidated the acts of Stephen VI and approved the acts of Formosus. But a little afterward, Sergius III again invalidated the acts of Formosus, and hence also of John, and approved the acts of Stephen. Necessarily, one of these Popes was opposed to the others and erred, as the Centuriators diligently observed. [523](#)

I respond: Stephen VI and Sergius III erred in a question of fact, not of law, and gave a bad example, not false doctrine. This is the history. Formosus, the Cardinal bishop of Portus, was deposed by Pope John VIII, and demoted and returned to the lay state, after which he swore that he would never return to the city, or the episcopate. A little after the death of John VIII, his successor, Martin II, absolved Formosus of his careless oath, and restored him to his original dignity. Not long after that, Formosus was created Pope. He lived for five years and died.

Stephen VI succeeded him who, being enkindled with great hatred against Formosus (or else unaware or not believing that he was absolved of his oath by Pope Martin), decreed publicly in a Council of bishops that Formosus was never a legitimate Pope and therefore, all his acts were invalid. He compelled all those who had received orders from him to be ordained again, just as if they had received nothing. This deed displeased everyone, and therefore three Popes in succession, Roman I, Theodore II and especially John IX, after calling another Episcopal Council, judged that Formosus was a true Pope and invalidated the sentence of Stephen VI. Next, Sergius III succeeded him and imitated Stephen VI in all things. The particular question was whether Formosus was a legitimate Pope. We do not deny that in such questions Popes can err, and Stephen and Sergius erred in fact.

But you will object: Stephen and Sergius not only judged that Formosus was not a true Pope, but even the sacred orders which he conferred were not valid; such is a manifest error against faith. Even if Formosus was not a Pope, and always remained deposed and demoted, still, because he was at one time a true bishop, and insofar as the character and power of orders cannot by any means be taken away, it is an error in faith to say that the sacred orders he conferred were not true orders.

I respond: Stephen and Sergius did not publish some decree whereby they determined the orders by a demoted bishop, or the orders that Formosus by name conferred after he had been demoted, must be conferred again; rather, they only *de facto* commanded them to be conferred again. Such a command proceeded not from ignorance or heresy, but from hatred against Formosus. Sigebert remarks in his *Chronicle* for the year 803 that Stephen VI was forcefully opposed by all those who were ordained by Formosus.

The twenty-ninth Pope is John XIII, or as some say, the XIV, whom the Centuriators accuse of a horrendous error and sacrilege, because he began to baptize bells against the institution of Christ, which other heretics frequently use in their objections against us. I wonder why they do not also say that we used to catechize and instruct the bells so that they could ring out the creed! They either condemn the matter itself, or the name “Baptism of Bells.” In the matter, clearly they are deceived, or else they are lying, for bells are not really baptized but only blessed and dedicated for divine worship, in the manner that churches, altars, chalices and other sacred vessels are blessed, as is clear from the pontifical where the blessing of bells is contained. Yet no mention is ever made there of baptism, and it is not said: “I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” Rather, only prayers to God are found there, just as in all other blessings. If they condemn the name, let them know the name of baptism is not from the Popes, but from common speech; as it is metaphorically accommodated to the blessing of bells because the people see the bells are sprinkled with holy water, and meanwhile names are given to them so that some may be distinguished from others.

The thirtieth Pope who is said to have erred is Sylvester II, whom Martin Polanus relates was a magician and sorcerer, and mangled by the devil in the Church of the Holy Cross at Jerusalem (Santa Croce). The Centuriators

[524](#) and Tilman Hesh [525](#) relate this narrative. It is a fact that sorcerers, just as the great part of infidels, worship the devil in place of God.

I respond: These are, without a doubt, fables which are told on the witchcraft and death of Sylvester II. For no author of good faith affirms that for certain, and the tomb of this Pope still exists in the Lateran Basilica, with an inscription placed on it by Pope Sergius IV, a holy man by the agreement of all writers, who was only five years after Sylvester. The inscription praises Sylvester as the best Pope. The occasion of making this story on the witchcraft of this Sylvester was because Sylvester was an expert in geometry and also wrote books on the subject. In that age, however (that is the 900s), which was more unlearned and infelicitous, anyone who devoted himself to mathematics or philosophy was reckoned commonly to be a magician. See Onuphrius in his annotation to Platina.

CHAPTER XIII: On Gregory VII.

THE THIRTY-FIRST who is accused of error by our adversaries is Pope Gregory, the seventh of that name. The Centuriators condemn him as a heretic, [526](#) a wizard, seditious, guilty of simony, an adulterer and the worst, not only of all Popes, but of all men. And for that reason they do not call him Gregory, as is his papal name, nor even Hildebrand, his name in life, but “Hellebrand”, which in German means the burning embers of hell.

Theodore Bibliander, in his *Chronicle*, would have it that the same Gregory is the very prince of Gog and Magog, and all other heretics of this time detest no Pontiff more than him. Above all Tilman Hesh clearly lies about the evils he relates concerning Gregory VII contained in his book of monks, Popes and their flatterers. [527](#) Still neither Tilman nor the Centuriators advance any witness apart from one: the testimony of a Cardinal Benno who lived in that time and left behind a written life of Gregory VII.

Reading the book of this Benno, and discovering it to be full of the most impudent lies, I am persuaded of one of two possibilities: either Benno never wrote any such book in that time and instead some Lutheran is really the author of this book, who published it under the name of Benno; or certainly that Benno did not so much write a life of Gregory VII, as under the name of Gregory, because he wished to depict what the worst Pontiff would do, in the manner in which Xenophon wrote a life of King Cyrus of Persia, not so much to relate what Cyrus did, as much as what the greatest ruler ought to do.

At any rate one must not put any trust in this work of Benno, and that is clear from the contrary works published on the matter of all other authors who lived at that time, in whom one must place greater trust. Both because they are many and he is only one, but also because Benno was created a cardinal by the antipope Clement III, whom the Holy Roman Emperor set up in hatred of Gregory, [528](#) not by the true Pope as Bibliander falsely

relates in his *Chronicle*, [529](#) where he falsely depicts Benno as an intimate of Gregory. Since he was the cardinal of an antipope, he could not speak well on the true Pope. Moreover, these other authors were of a neutral party confined by some benefice and therefore judged more correctly. That what the rest write is contrary to the things which Benno wrote, can be easily proven.

There are four claims to which everything that Benno writes can be reduced. 1) That Gregory VII seized the pontificate by military force without either the vote of any Cardinal or a consensus of the clergy and people. But St. Anselm, the bishop of Lugo (who lived at that time), wrote a letter to Wilbert, a man in schism with the antipope Clement III, saying: “That I might speak on our Father, Blessed Gregory, what St. Cyprian wrote about Cornelius: He was made a bishop by the judgment of God and Christ, by nearly all the clergy, and, that I might speak more truly, absolutely by the acclamation of all, from the suffrage of the people who were then present, to the gathering of the elder priests and good men, since it happened that no man before him, since the place of Alexander, that is, the place of Peter, and the step of the sacerdotal chair was vacant, etc.” The Abbot of Ursberg relates this epistle in his *Chronicle*, and adds that this Anselm was a very learned and holy man, and was glorified with miracles in life and after death.

The form of election of this Pope is extant in Platina, in these words: “We, cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, clergy, acolytes, subdeacons, priests, with bishops, abbots and many other ecclesiastics present, as well as laity, elect today, 22 April, in the Basilica of St. Peter in Chains, in the year of our Savior 1078, as the true vicar of Christ, Hildebrand the archdeacon, a man of much doctrine, great piety, prudence, justice, constancy, religion, who is modest, sober and continent, etc.” Such a form appears to have been preserved by divine providence to argue against the lies of Benno. Likewise, all other authors write the same, whom we will cite below.

2) Benno writes that Gregory VII excommunicated Henry IV even though he was innocent (as the Centuriators make bold to assert). [530](#) But Stephen, the bishop of Halberstadt, a holy and learned man, wrote in that time these words to bishop Walram, as Dodechinus witnesses in his addition to Marianus Scotus, in the year 1090, as well as Trithemius in his *Chronicle*: “Listen to what is true, not shams; listen to what is more

steadfast, not jokes; anyone that sells spiritual dignities is a heretic (simoniac); but the Lord Henry, whom they call king, sells episcopates and abbacies. Indeed Constance, Bamberg, Moguntia and many others, for money; Regensburg, Augsburg and Strasburg for a sword; the Abbey of Fulda for adultery; for the episcopate of Munster, which is unlawful to say and hear, he sold for foul sodomy. If you were to impudently deny these things, with heaven and earth as a witness, even all those responding from the furnace with a little knowledge shall deduce this: the Lord Henry is a heretic. For such unlawful evils he was excommunicated by the Apostolic See; he can exercise no power over us, because we are Catholic.”

Marianus Scotus, who lived in the time of Henry IV says: “Catholic men, seeing and hearing these crimes, as well as wicked and unheard of matters like unto them that were done by King Henry, were constituted with zeal in the Church, being zealous, like the prophet Elijah, for the house of Israel. After messages had been directed to Rome to Alexander the bishop of the Apostolic See, they bemoaned by letters, as by a groan and affliction of the living voice, these and other deeds which were a great many that were said and done by the insane heretical simoniacs, having King Henry as their author and patron.” [531](#)

Likewise, Dedekindus, the continuator of Marianus, in the year 1106 says: “Henry was a perverse man and it is manifestly certain that he was cast out from the Church by a just judgment; for he sold all spiritual things.” The same author in the year 1090 and 1093 relates many crimes of Henry IV. Also, St. Anselm of Canterbury wrote an epistle at the same time to Walram, which preceded his book on unleavened bread, where he calls Henry the successor of Nero, Domitian and Diocletian. Next, Lambert of Schaffnaburg relates not a few crimes of Henry, as well as the Abbot of Ursberg, [532](#) Albert Kranz, [533](#) Joannes Aventinus, [534](#) to which authors the Centuriators usually attribute much. But what does Calvin confess on the matter? He writes thus: “The Emperor Henry, the Fourth of that name, was a capricious and bold man, of no counsel, but great boldness and dissolute life. He had the episcopates of the whole of Germany in his halls, some for sale, others abandoned for plunder.” [535](#)

3) Benno writes that Pope Gregory was a Berengarian heretic; that is, he did not believe for certain that the body of Christ was present in the Eucharist. But certainly nothing less true can be said about this Pope. For

(that I might omit the fact that he is called a saint by all writers, that Leo IX and Nicholas II, who condemned Berengarius, always communicated with him, that no approved author, not even Sigebert who had little love for him, has dared to advance such a thing) Gregory himself, while presiding at the Council of Turin as a legate of the Pope condemned the same Berengarius. Guitmundus writes the following: "The Church herself soon condemned the fabrications which had arisen from Berengarius through Pope Leo. Thereupon, he convicted him in the Council of Turin, through the one who is now our blessed Pope Gregory when he was an archdeacon of the same Roman See. Moreover, as it seemed Berengarius himself was corrected, he [Gregory] mercifully received his hands in the Sacrament. When Berengarius later returned to his vomit, Pope Nicholas of holy memory again refuted him in the general council at Rome." [536](#)

But lest they might say that Gregory, when he was an archdeacon, was Catholic, but then a heretic when he was made Pope, let Thomas the Waldensian be read where he relates word for word the opinion of this seventh Pope Gregory, which he imposed in the Roman Council against Berengarius in the sixth year of his pontificate, from which it will appear most clearly that Benno is lying. [537](#)

4) Benno writes that Gregory was a most wicked man, a simoniac, a magician, an adulterer, a murderer, that he covered up all his crimes; and he relates certain histories of which there is not a vestige extant in good authors, and still Illyricus and Tilman pass them off as oracles from heaven.

Nearly every other author who lived in that time, and in later ages wrote the contrary. Now, I will advance the Germans alone. Trithemus in his Chronicle, writes on the council of the emperor: "William, the Abbot of Hirsau, was called to this wicked council, he scorned to do so, for indeed he knew that the vicar of Christ was holy and innocent." Otho of Frisia says: "Hildebrand was always constant in ecclesiastical rigor." [538](#) And in the same work, he says: "The form of the flock became what he taught by word, he showed by example; being strong, he did not fear to place himself as a wall for the house of the Lord through all struggles." [539](#) Again: "The Church, bereaved of such a pastor, who among all priests and Roman Pontiffs, was of outstanding zeal and authority, had no little sorrow." [540](#) Kranz says: "Henry IV encroached upon the laws of the Church,

establishing bishops at will, forsaking the Supreme Pontiff Gregory VII, and he persecuted that holy man.” [541](#)

The Abbot of Ursberg does not seem to have dared to praise Gregory VII too openly, yet still, in three places, he shows his opinion. Firstly, where he reproaches Henry IV in clear words: “In the year of our Lord 1068, King Henry, having used the freedom of adolescence, began to dwell in Saxony alone from all the Empire. He despised princes and oppressed nobles, while raising those of lower rank on high, and devoted himself to hunting, soft living, and other exercises of this sort, more than to justice which needed to be done, as he has been condemned. He married daughters of nobles to anyone of obscure birth; he set up private guards, not trusting the powerful very much.... This last end, ruin and lot of Henry was to be known as the fourth Roman emperor under that name by his own; but by Catholics, that is, by everyone united to Blessed Peter and his successors, preserving trust and obedience to Christian law, he was called the chief of pirates, together with heresiarch, apostate and persecutor more of souls than of bodies.” There, while he teaches that Henry sunk from adolescence into tyranny, he shows that the judgment of Gregory against the same king was just.

Next, below that, when he cited the words of the assembly against Gregory, and then the defense of St. Anselm for the same Gregory, the Abbot so adds: “bishop Anselm wrote these things exceedingly contrary to his earlier opinion, a man clearly erudite in letters, with a keen intellect, particular eloquence, and what is best of all, he was most noted in the fear of God and holy conversation, to the point that both in life and after death, he is glorified by the relation of miracles.” Certainly, it is no wonder if he who places those that praised Gregory before the condemners, also, seems to tacitly praise Gregory.

Later, he speaks about the successor of Gregory VII: “Desiderius, a Roman cardinal, abbot of Cassino, and true servant of Christ, although he struggled much in heart together with his body. But laboring with great infirmity, he was brought forth to this supreme apex and he obtained by prayers, that he would be taken from this life in a few days.” Who could question that this Desiderius, if he was a true servant of Christ, would never have approved the cause of Gregory, unless he recognized it was most just?

Nauclerus, in his *Chronicle*, says: “Gregory was a religious man, fearing God, a lover of equity and justice, constant in difficulties, who, on account

of God, did not fear to complete anything in those matters which pertain to justice.” [542](#)

Marianus Scotus, a monk of Fulda, who lived in the time of Gregory VII, says: “Having heard the just complaints and cries of Catholics against Henry, as well as the barbarity of his crimes, burning with the zeal of God, Gregory then pronounced excommunication on the aforesaid king, particularly due to simony. What he did greatly pleased many Catholic men, although the simoniacs and flatterers of the king were greatly displeased.”

[543](#)

Dodechinus the abbot, the continuator of Marianus, adds for the year 1085: “Urban himself confirmed the writings and declarations of the venerable Pope Gregory against the schismatics.” And, in the year 1090, names Gregory “Pope of blessed memory”.

Lambert Schaffnaburg, who lived in the same time, in his history of German affairs, says: “The constancy of Hildebrand, his spirit unconquered against avarice, excluded all arguments of human fallacy... The signs and wonders that were done more frequently by the prayers of Pope Gregory and his most fervent zeal for God and ecclesiastical laws sufficiently fortified him against the poison tongues of his detractors.”

Likewise, he relates the death of William, bishop of Utrecht, who opposed Gregory together with Benno: “Immediately seized by a grave illness, he uttered miserable cries in the presence of all; then, by a just judgment of God, lost the present as well as eternal life, because he had offered to the king his devoted labor for all things which he had so criminally done, and also in the hope of his favor, knowing the grave contumelies against the most holy Roman Pontiff, a man of apostolic virtues, even calling for penalties against him when he was innocent.”

Next, he says in the same place: “The Pope, after he celebrated a solemn Mass, advanced upon the king with the Lord’s body in his hand and clearly declared: ‘For too long I have been accused by you and your flatterers that I took possession of the Apostolic See by simony and that I have stained my life with other crimes. Therefore, I am cutting short such satisfaction, that I shall take away every scruple from every scandal; I ask God that, by his judgment, he might absolve me from the suspicion of the adjacent crime, if innocent, or that I might be killed immediately if guilty.’ Then he took up part of the Lord’s body and ate. This being freely done, since the people

rejoiced in the innocence of the Pope and applauded him in praises of God for a considerable time, he turned to the king and said: 'Please, do what you have seen me do.' The king, after procuring a postponement, refused to cleanse himself or his injustices in this manner; for after he went back to his own, he returned to his normal character and would not rest until he had expelled St. Gregory from the city and substituted Gilbert of Ravenna in his place."

John Aventinus remains from the Germans, who wrote in our century. Although he writes many things on Gregory from some author without a name, and for that reason is without authority, still he was occasionally overcome by truth. He condemned Henry and praises Gregory: "Henry burned with the infamies of sexual affairs, lovers, unchastity and adultery, which even his friends do not deny." [544](#) And in the same place: "Gregory emerges as a most holy steadfast man. Paul Bernrietensis, who recounts his life in two books, and his remaining shrewd champions, advance his side."

Thus we have the innocence of Gregory proven three-fold: by the testimony of writers, the testimony of dying adversaries, and the testimony of God, when invoked by the Pontiff. Only one calumny remains, namely, that of Sigebert in his *Chronicle*, where he writes that Gregory VII thought that, should priests who had concubines wish to carry out sacred functions, they could not really consecrate, and for that reason, forbade Christians to communicate with priests who had concubines.

I respond: Sigebert was among the secretaries of Henry IV, as Trithemius relates in his *Catalogue of Writers*, and therefore he interpreted the interdict of Gregory in a perverse manner. Moreover, what Gregory commanded is far better and more faithfully related by St. Anselm, who is older and holier than Sigebert. He says: "On the priests who are publicly reprov'd and show themselves to God cursed by carnal relations, it must altogether be feared that apostolic providence constituted an ecclesiastical and just rigor, without a doubt, it is by no means fitting that there one might reverently assist where they, making a stench with impudent lust, scorn the prohibition of God and the saints, and forsake sacred altars; nay more, they do not merely forsake them, but they have foully defiled them in the same measure. Not in the way in which someone will scorn those things which he treats, but rather he thinks those treating them so must be cursed just like those who do not reverence the presence of God and angels, or are repulsed by the

detestation of men; they must cease to contaminate sacred things.” [545](#) He correctly explained the decree of Gregory that was published in his own time.

Now, it is fitting to ascribe a catalogue of those authors who wrote honorably about Gregory VII. First, Leo Hostiensis wrote in the age of Gregory himself (around the year 1080) many things on his sanctity in which there are also heavenly revelations and visions of approved servants of God. [546](#) In the same time period, Marianus Scotus wrote on Gregory as a holy Pope from the year 1075 even to the year 1083. [547](#) Likewise Lambert Schaffnaburg, [548](#) and St. Anselm of Canterbury. [549](#) St. Anselm of Lucca in his epistle to Guibert and Stephen Halberstatensis in his epistle to Walramus found in Dodechinus, in an addition to Marianus Scotus. Bernard Corbeiensis [550](#) which Trithemius witnesses in his *Catalogue of Writers*, as well as Guitmundus. [551](#) Next, Paul Berniensis, and Gerochus Reichersperg, who wrote on behalf of Gregory and for that reason suffered exile, as John Aventinus witnesses. [552](#) These, therefore, constitute ten holy and learned writers who defended Gregory while he was alive. The only one who accuses him from these writers is the pseudo-cardinal Benno.

Next, around the year 1100 we have Sigebert, in his *Chronicle*. We already noted how he favored the Emperor Henry IV; still, he never dared to ascribe any crime to Gregory of the sort which Benno and the Centuriators relate; he only attributed to him inconsiderate zeal, and error concerning the ministers of the Sacrament, about which Anselm sufficiently exculpates him. Next, the same Sigebert, in the same place, is not silent that Anselm of Lucca wrote for Gregory, and God showed the sanctity of this Anselm by signs and wonders, which certainly pertains to the great praise of Gregory. Not long after, Gratian, in the year 1150, referred to the decree of Gregory. [553](#) Otho of Frisia, outstanding for his race, erudition and most noble in integrity of life, wrote for our Gregory. [554](#) Likewise, William of Tyre around the year 1180 [555](#) and Gottfried Viterbiensis. [556](#)

Conrad, the Abbot of Ursberg in his *Chronicle* around the year 1200, although he does not clearly praise Gregory, does not reproach him either

but he praises him (as we said above) more secretly in many ways, but does not condemn him. In the same time Dodechinus, in an addition to Marianus Scotus, openly praises Gregory, and reproaches Henry. Vincentius, around the year 1250, witnessed that Gregory VII was famous for miracles and the gift of prophecy. St. Thomas cites the same man with honor. [557](#) Martin Polanus, around the year 1300, in the life of the same Gregory. And John Villanus, [558](#) Blondus around the year 1400, [559](#) Matthew Palmerius in his *Chronicle* and Thomas the Waldensian. [560](#) St. Antoninus around the year 1450, [561](#) Platina, in the life of Gregory, as well as Aeneas Sylvius (Pope Pius II) in the compendium of Blondus. John Trithemius, around the year 1500 in his *Chronicle*. John Naclerus in his *Chronicle*, Albert Kranz [562](#) and Sabellicus [563](#) as well as Volaterranus. [564](#) They all clearly describe him as a holy man. These are thirty-two authors, whom we oppose to the one witness of Benno, so as to blunt the impudence of the Centuriators and Tilman and certainly to refute the lie of Tilman, who made bold to write that the “crimes” of Gregory VII were brought to light by Monks and flatterers of the Pope, when we have shown the contrary: that Gregory was praised by all.

CHAPTER XIV: On the Remaining Popes to Whom Error in Faith is Falsely Attributed.

THE THIRTY-SECOND is Alexander III. In the chapter *Cum esses* (on wills), he says it is foreign to divine law and the custom of the Church that more than three witnesses would be required for wills, and in the same place he commands under penalty of excommunication that no one may rescind a will made with three witnesses. But the contrary is in practice throughout the whole Christian world; nor are wills held as ratified unless seven witnesses were applied. The same Pope Alexander, in the chapter *Licet*, on a spouse of two people, says that certain predecessors judged that Matrimony contracted through words in person, but still not consummated, could be invalidated through another matrimony; but he thought the contrary. From which it follows that either Alexander or his predecessors erred.

I respond: To the first with the Gloss of Canonists; Alexander did not publish that law except for men subject to himself in temporal as well as spiritual affairs; and hence that canon does not disparage civil laws, nor the practice of the remaining Christian world. Or if he passed down a law for all Christians, it ought to only be understood for pious reasons, concerning which the Church judges; that is, the Pontiff wished that wills, not all, but only those which make either the Church or a local pious person their heir, that they should be valid even if it were made with only three witnesses applied. To the second, I say that neither Alexander nor his predecessors defined anything, but only expressed what they thought.

The thirty-third is Celestine III, whom Alphonsus de Castro asserts could not be excused from heresy in any way, because he taught matrimony could be so dissolved by heresy and that it would be lawful for one to enter into another marriage when his prior spouse had fallen into heresy. [565](#) Even if this decree of Celestine were not extant, still it was formerly in ancient decretals, in the chapter *Laudabilem*, on the conversion of infidels,

which is the decree Alphonsus says that he saw. Moreover, that this teaching of Celestine is heretical is clear, because Innocent III taught the contrary on divorce, [566](#) and the Council of Trent also defined the same thing. [567](#)

I respond: Neither Celestine nor Innocent stated anything certain on the matter; but each responded with what seemed more probable to them. That is manifestly gathered from the words of Innocent who, when he says his predecessor thought otherwise, shows in his opinion that the whole matter was still being thought out. On the other hand, Alphonsus says the epistle of Celestine was at one time among the epistles in the decretals. While certainly that is true, it cannot thence be gathered that a plainly apostolic decree was made by Celestine, or even one *ex cathedra*; since it is certain that there are many epistles in the decretals which do not make any matter *de fide*, but only declare to us the opinions of the Pontiff on some affair.

The thirty-fourth is Innocent III, who in the chapter, *Per venerabilem*, concerning who might be legitimate sons, teaches the old law was not yet plainly abrogated: “Clearly, since Deuteronomy means the second law, it is proved from the force of the word, that what is discerned there ought to be observed in the New Testament.” But this decree of Innocent is opposed to a decree of St. Paul in Acts 15.

I respond: Innocent, in that place, did not wish to say that Deuteronomy ought to be preserved even today by the letter, but insofar as what was said there was a figure of the New Testament. Therefore, Innocent thought Deuteronomy was called second law, because it contained figuratively pertinent matters to the new law.

The thirty-fifth is Nicholas IV, who in the Chapter *Exiit*, on the meaning of the words *in Sexto*, defined that Christ in word and example taught perfect poverty which consists in the abdication of all things, with no ownership being left to himself, neither in particular nor in common, and hence such poverty is holy and meritorious. Yet John XXII taught that this is false and heretical in his *Extravagantes*, [568](#) on the title of the meaning of the words. For in *Extravagantes*, to the fashioner of the canon, he teaches it is impossible that such poverty whereby someone should swear off all ownership in matters pertaining to the use of consumable things, while only retaining the use; and again in *Extravagantes*, where among several points, he declares it heretical to say that Christ taught such poverty by word and

example. Also in *Extravagantes*, under the title of *Quia quorundam*, he teaches the same thing, and more amply drives home the point. Juan Torquemada tries in all things to reconcile these Popes, just as even John himself attempts to show himself to disagree with Nicolas. [569](#)

But certainly, unless I am greatly deceived, in all things they cannot be reconciled. And therefore, we must observe that John and Nicholas treat three questions. 1) Whether in matters in regard to the use of consumables one can separate use from ownership. 2) Whether poverty, which removes all ownership from itself, being left behind only in use, may be holy and meritorious. 3) Whether Christ taught such poverty by word and example.

Pope John himself responds to the first in the following manner: One cannot separate use from ownership in matters of this sort, for to have ownership is to be able to destroy a thing. Hence it is impossible that one can destroy a thing by use, such as by eating bread, and not be the master of that thing. But Nicholas teaches it can be done, and rightly, for afterward, Clement V clearly taught the same thing in *Clementina*, “*Exivi de paradiso*,” on the meaning of the words of Nicholas, and the reasoning is clear. He argues that because one is a master, he is not able to destroy anything in any manner; but he can freely destroy a thing after someone might have wanted it, and even given, sold, commuted etc. Furthermore, it is certain that all true religious have the use of the bread which they eat, and the wine which they drink; still they cannot give, sell, change or throw them away, etc. Now, you might say, then Pope John must have erred. I respond, it is true, but not in the matter itself; for this question does not pertain to the faith, as John himself says in *Extravagantes*, because it is of certain worldly things; and even more, there are different opinions of teachers on this matter.

On the second question, Nicholas thought that poverty is holy and meritorious; John denied it. Furthermore, on each point Nicholas thinks better, yet Nicholas neither defined this as though it were an article of faith, nor did John directly oppose it. For John, in those matters discussed in *Extravagantes*, to the fashioner of the canons, only intends to renounce the mastery of those things which are given to Franciscans, and, as Nicholas asserted, these things were the Roman Pontiffs'; moreover, John could renounce a law of this sort.

On the third question (which is the most serious of all and pertains to faith), Nicholas and John do not disagree. For Nicholas says that at some time Christ taught that most perfect poverty by word and example: moreover, at some time he showed poverty was less rigid by example, just as the common father and teacher of all. Furthermore, John defined it heretical to assert that Christ had nothing of his own here on earth, neither in particular nor in common. These two propositions are not opposed to each other. Nicholas does not deny Christ at some time had something of his own at least in common; rather he denies that Christ always led such a life. John also does not deny that Christ at some time had nothing of his own, neither in particular nor in common, but denies that Christ always led such a life.

That Christ taught each by word and example is proved; for he taught poverty by every means in Matthew 10, when he says: "Do not possess gold, nor silver, nor money in your belts, nor a hat nor two tunics, nor shoes or a staff." Neither relates whether these words sound like a precept, or a counsel, and whether they might be expressed otherwise than on abdication of all ownership. For it is enough to preserve the opinion of Nicholas, what this doctrine of Christ might be, and what this sense is not opposed to, as really it is not opposed. Although Christ added: "The laborer is worth his wage," he obligated the people to sustain preachers, and hence conceded to preachers that they might rightly furnish sustenance from the people. Still, he did not oblige those preachers that they should furnish something as though it were due, as is clear from Paul in 1 Corinth. 9, but he permitted them to live on their own labors, even to receive just as a gift without any usurpation of ownership, what is due to them from justice. It happens that in this sense, St. Francis received these words and the institutions; God approved this man with many miracles, as well as the common consensus of the universal Church.

The Lord also shows the same thing in this very example, as is clear from Matthew 8. "The Son of Man does not have a place where he might recline his head," as well as that of Luke 8: "Women followed him, who ministered to him from their resources." For then the Lord lived on the almsgiving of others with the Apostles without a blemish.

The Lord also taught another type of life by his example, which is clear from John 13, where we read that he had places from which he lived in common with his disciples; nor is there a doubt whether they had ownership

of certain monies, at least in common, seeing that they had been accustomed to distribute alms, as is clear from the same place. The faithful who were in Jerusalem later imitated such a life, [570](#) just as nearly all orders of religious. For with the exception of the Franciscans, all have, at least in common, ownership of moveable things.

The thirty-sixth is Pope John XXII, who is condemned by many, and especially by William of Ockham [571](#) and by Adrian, [572](#) because he had taught that the souls of the blessed were not going to see God before the resurrection. Erasmus himself affirms this with an addition. [573](#) He says: “In such an error it appears was Pope John, the twenty-second of that name, being compelled by works of the theologians of Paris to recant in the presence of Philip the king of the French, not without embarrassment. John Gerson says this in his sermon on Easter.”

Calvin adds that the same Pope John taught that souls are mortal. “But if they would have the privilege which they claim to be confirmed, they must expunge from their list of pontiffs John XXII who publicly asserted that the soul is mortal and perishes with the body until the day of resurrection. And so, that you would observe that the whole See with its chief props then altogether fell, none of the Cardinals opposed his madness, only the Faculty of Paris urged the king to insist on a recantation. The king forbade his subjects from communion [with him], unless he would immediately recant; he published an interdict in the usual way by a herald. Thus necessitated, John abjured his error.” Yet Calvin does not prove from any source, but placed in the margin: “John Gerson, who then lived, was the witness.”

[574](#)

I respond: first, to Adrian. John, at that time, really thought that souls would not see God unless it were after the resurrection: others so reckoned when still it was lawful without danger of heresy, since still no definition of the Church had gone before him. John, moreover, wished to define the question, but while still preparing and in consultations, died, as Benedict XII, his successor, witnessed in *Extravagantes* which begins: *Benedictus Deus*; the whole of which Alphonsus a Castro relates. [575](#)

Furthermore, John Villanus relates that Pope John, before his death, partly declared and even partly recanted his opinion. [576](#) First, it is on

good evidence that he never had it in his mind, although he had spoken on this matter, to define the question, rather only to treat it so as to discover the truth. Next, he added that John already thought the opinion was the more probable that asserts the souls of the blessed enjoy the divine vision even before the day of judgment, and he embraced this opinion, unless at some time the Church would have defined otherwise, and he subjected all his teachings freely to its definition. This retraction simply teaches that the mind of Pope John XXII was always good and Catholic.

To Calvin I say, he most impudently tells five lies in but a few words. First, John Gerson did not live at the same time as John XXII. It is certain from John Villanus [577](#) and all other historians that John XXII died in the year 1334, while Gerson was born in 1363. [578](#) Therefore, Gerson was not yet born when Pope John died.

The second lie is that Gerson might have said Pope John denied the immortality of the soul. For Gerson says nothing on the errors of John, except in a sermon on Easter, which is held in volume 4, which alone is cited by all against the error of John. There, moreover, Gerson says: "He did this, to the thief, who seems not yet to have fulfilled the penance for all his sins, yet was beatified and saw God face to face at that proper hour, just as the saints in Paradise. For that reason the falsity of the doctrine of Pope John XXII on that point appears." He neither expresses more what such a doctrine was, but when he said: "There appears the falsity of the doctrine of Pope John," the very reason that the thief crucified with Christ soon after death saw God, manifestly shows Pope John erred in this, because he believed the souls of the saints do not see God immediately after death. Yet, neither Gerson nor anyone else who wrote before Calvin, not even William of Ockham, a most hostile enemy of that Pope, asserts that John XXII denied the immortality of the soul.

But I see why Calvin devised such a dreadful lie, because the error of Pope John on the vision of God is not an error for Calvin, but rather a doctrine. For he says only Christ is in heaven; the rest of the saints await in a type of hall even to the end of the world. [579](#) He adds: "The saints after death are still joined together with us. But if they have faith, therefore they do not see God." [580](#) Therefore, because Calvin saw what others condemned in Pope John, he could not condemn him; still, he refused to

pass over the occasion to accuse a Pope, so he fled to his teacher, the father of lies, and from him changed the whole affair into a characteristic calumny.

The third lie is that no cardinal opposed the teaching of John. This is clearly false, because neither Gerson nor any other says this, and because many thought the contrary, as was clear from the definition which was made by Pope Benedict XII after the death of John from the consensus of all Cardinals which is clear in the epistle of Benedict. Nor was there a reason why these, who thought the contrary, should fear to oppose John while he was living. Benedict XII, in his *Extravagantes*, asserts that Pope John severely commanded the cardinals and others, all teachers, that they should give their true opinion so that the truth would be discovered. Next, John Villanus, who did live at that time, writes that the greater part of the cardinals opposed the opinion of Pope John while he lived. [581](#)

The fourth lie of Calvin is that the king of France forbade his subjects communion with John. The fact that King Philip of France believed the Parisian Theologians more than John as a private teacher on that question, is witnessed by Gerson in the cited place; but how, on that account, he would have excommunicated the Pope, no one tells, nor is it believable that a Christian king at that time would have dared to do such a thing.

The fifth lie is that the Pope abjured his error. This, also, neither Gerson writes, nor any other nor ought the Pope abjure error, when he never fell into error. He retracted his opinion the day before he died, but by the advice of those close to him, not at the command of the king. [582](#) Nor is it true that John was compelled to repent, and it is much less true that it happened in the presence of King Philip.

The thirty-seventh is John XXIII (anti-pope), who at the Council of Constance, sess. 11, is accused of a very pernicious heresy; for it is said that he denied the future life, and resurrection of the body. I respond: John XXIII was not a Pope, and it is certain and undoubted, hence it is not necessary to defend him at all. There were in those times three men that claimed to be Pope, Gregory XII, Benedict XIII, and John XXIII. It could not easily be determined who among them was the true and legitimate Pope, since none of them lacked very learned men as patrons. I add in addition that it is very probable and nearly certain that the error is falsely attributed to this anti-pope John. For in the first place when in that session of the council the articles that he objected to were enumerated, they first placed 53

articles, which all pertain to custom, and all these were confirmed by certain witnesses. Next, others are advanced without certain witnesses, and the second to last of these is the one on which we are now arguing.

Therefore, this point was not proven, except by common rumor, which, because people saw John was of dissolute life, they began to reckon and even say that he did not believe in the future life or the resurrection of the body. But who does not see that heresy is not truly gathered from bad deeds? How many can be counted who believed rightly and lived a most degenerate life? Next, in sess. 12, the definitive opinion of the council against John also briefly reviewed the reasons for his condemnation and deposition, but no mention is made of error, or of heresy. Certainly the argument is evidence that it cannot be proven that this "Pope John" was an object of heresy. For if it could have been proved, it ought to have been reviewed in the first place among the reasons of condemnation, since there is no more just cause of judging a Pope than the note of heresy; nay more, there is no other reason why a Pontiff can justly be judged.

The thirty-eighth Pope is Benedict XIII, whom the Council of Constance condemns in the name of heresy. [583](#) But this Benedict was not a legitimate Pope, since he succeeded Clement VII, who had invaded the papal seat while Urban VI was still alive, but still he was not truly a heretic. The only thing objected against him is that he did not believe a council had greater power than the Supreme Pontiff, in which affair Benedict did not err at all.

The thirty-ninth is Eugene IV, whose pontificate was abrogated by the Council of Basel, [584](#) because he had fallen into heresy. But he also did not err in any truth. Wherefore, the Council of Lausana continued his earlier acts and Nicholas V, the successor of Eugene, was venerated as a true Pope, as can be recognized from the letter of the same Nicholas, which is usually attached to the Council of Basel in the volumes of councils.

The fortieth Pope to be accused of error is Innocent VIII, who seems to have sinned because he permitted the Norwegians to celebrate the sacrifice without wine, as Raphael Volateranus relates. [585](#) But this can be answered easily. For in the first place he did not publish a decree wherein he declares something for the universal Church, namely that it is lawful to offer the sacrifice of the Mass without wine. Therefore, if he erred, he erred in fact, not in doctrine. Next, he did not permit another liquor to be

confecting in place of wine, which would pervert the matter of the Sacrament; he only permitted that they might consecrate the Eucharist only under the species of bread on account of extreme necessity, since in that region wine cannot be preserved, thus it quickly sours. But certainly there is either no error, or certainly the error was not explored. It happens that it is baffling that in that time they did not have the use of wine, or could not preserve it, since in our time it is so frequently used because the heretics do not wish to communicate without it.

CHAPTER XV: A Question is Proposed: Whether the Supreme Pontiff Has Jurisdiction that is Truly Coercive, so that he can Make Laws Which Oblige in Conscience as well as Judge and Punish Transgressors?

SO FAR we have proven that the Supreme Pontiff is a judge of controversies which arise in the Church and that he is certain and infallible in his judgment. Now follows the third question: *Whether the Supreme Pontiff can compel the faithful to believe or do that which he has judged.* The same thing is understood about other bishops, save for proportion. But before we come either to our arguments or those of our adversaries, it will be worthwhile to record a few things on the state of the question, as well as the opinion of our adversaries.

Therefore, first it must be noted that we do not speak about the Pope as a temporal prince of a certain province. In this manner, it is certain that he can impose laws on his subjects and also turn to them with the sword. The heretics do not deny this in regard to the arrangement wherein the Pope is a temporal prince, although they deny it is fitting for him to exercise such a rule. We will speak more on that matter in the next book. Therefore, now we only treat on the Pontiff as he is the Pontiff of the whole Catholic Church. Moreover, we ask whether he may have true power over all the faithful in spiritual matters just as temporal kings have in temporal affairs, to the extent that, just as they can make civil laws, so also the Pope can make ecclesiastical laws truly obliging in conscience as well as punish transgressors with spiritual penalties at least, such as excommunication, suspension, interdict, irregularity, etc. We will treat on temporal or civil power which the Pope has either directly or indirectly in the following

book. At present we are only discussing the spiritual or ecclesiastical, whose end is eternal life.

Secondly, it must be noted that we are only treating on just laws. Unjust laws are not properly called laws, as Augustine teaches. [586](#) Moreover, four conditions are required for a law to be just. 1) On the side of the end, that it is ordained to a common good; for as a king differs from a tyrant, [587](#) in that the former seeks the common advantage, while the latter seeks his own, so also a just law differs from a tyrannical one. 2) On the side of the agent, that it should be from one having authority, for no one can impose a law except upon a subject. 3) On the side of the matter, that it should not forbid virtue, nor command a vice. 4) On the side of form, that a law should be clearly promulgated and constituted in a measure and order due to it, so that a law would preserve that proportion in the distribution of honors and imposition of burdens which subjects have in rank toward the common good.

For if the Pontiff would command that boys as well as grown men, the strong and the weak, healthy and sick should fast during Lent the law would be unjust. [588](#) Likewise, if he would establish that only the rich and nobles could be admitted to the episcopacy, but not the poor or commoners even if they be otherwise more learned and better, it would be absolutely unjust; although we must note that somewhere at some time, on account of some circumstance it *could* be just. But even if an unjust law is not a law and from its force does not oblige in conscience, nevertheless, a distinction must be made concerning laws. For unjust laws by reason of the matter, that is, which are contrary to divine, natural or even positive law, do not only not oblige, but they even ought to not be observed in any way, according to what we read in Acts 5: "It is proper to obey God more than men." Jerome, [589](#) Augustine, [590](#) and Bernard also teach that. [591](#) But even those laws that are unjust regard to their end, or authority, or even to their form and manner of promulgation must be observed when scandal would follow. This can be deduced from what we read in Matthew, "He who would constrain you to walk a mile, go with him even another two, but if he would ask you for a tunic, give him your cloak also." [592](#) The sense is not that we should always do this but that we should be prepared to do it and whenever it will be necessary for the glory of God. Likewise, from 1 Peter:

“Slaves be subject to your masters, not only to the good and modest, but even to the wicked.” [593](#)

Lastly, it must be noted that the opinion that teaches there is no authority in the Church to make laws that oblige the faithful in conscience pleases many heretics. So formerly the Waldenses thought, as St. Antoninus attests. [594](#) Marsilius of Padua taught the same thing in a book titled *Defender of Peace*, against which Albert Pighius wrote; [595](#) John Wycliffe taught the same thing, [596](#) from where it was gathered that the decretals of the Popes were apocryphal, and only stupid men devoted themselves to recognizing them. Jan Hus later taught the same thing, as John de Wessalia notes in a little book on his condemnation that was made at Moguntium, in 1479, the first of which was that the prelates of the Church could not make a law which obliges in conscience but could only exhort men to keep the commandments of God.

Thereafter in our own times, all Lutherans and Calvinists teach the same thing. Above all Luther in his book *On the Babylonian Captivity*, in the chapter on Baptism: “By what right does the Pope constitute laws over us? Who gave him the power of placing the liberty that was given to us through Baptism captive, when neither the Pope nor a bishop nor any man should have the right to constitute one syllable over a true Christian unless it were done by the consent of the same.” He teaches similar things in his book on Christian liberty, which Iodocus Clichouseus refutes, [597](#) as well as John of Rochester [Fisher] in his attack on the assertion of article 27. [598](#) Yet Luther most vehemently treats it in his explication of the vision of Daniel, and that he might condemn ecclesiastical laws even by his deeds, in the year 1520 he publicly burned the whole body of canon law, as John Cochlaeus writes in the life of Luther. [599](#)

Melanchthon teaches the same thing in the Augsburg Confession and in his defense of the same; [600](#) so does Calvin; [601](#) the opinion of all of them is nearly the same, and can be reduced to certain headings.

1) They teach that bishops and hence even the Pope can constitute a certain order in the Church to preserve useful discipline, such as to define on what day men should go to church, who should sing the Psalms and how,

or the Scriptures that must be read in the Church, etc.; but still, such constitutions do not oblige in conscience, except by reason of scandal, so that one would be free to keep or not keep these laws in a manner without scandal to others. But the Pope or bishops cannot constitute any true law which is not expressly in Scripture.

2) They teach that not only can the Pope or bishops not make a new law, but neither can they compel Christians to keep the law of God by a command from authority. Even if it occurs in the form of judgment in proceeding against transgressors, still they can only resort to exhortation, advice and rebuke to make men preserve the law of God.

3) They teach that while there is a power of excommunicating in the Church (that is, of rejecting incorrigible men from the body), nevertheless, they do not mean this power is in the Pope or the bishop per se, but only in the Church, which for them means the body of ministers along with the consent of the people. This should not be a wonder, since they deny the Pope is greater than a bishop, or a bishop greater than a priest in regard to authority. Moreover, they grant nothing to priests except that they can preach and minister the Sacraments to those men over whom a secular magistrate commands.

But in the Catholic Church it has always been believed that bishops over their dioceses (as well as the Roman Pontiff over the whole Church), are true ecclesiastical princes, who can impose laws that oblige in conscience, judge in ecclesiastical cases, and at length, punish by the custom of others—all without the consensus of the people or the counsel of priests. We will briefly prove these things.

CHAPTER XVI: That Popes can Make True Laws is Proven from the Testimony of the Word of God.

HEREFORE, the Catholic teaching is proven from many kinds of arguments, but first from Sacred Scripture. The first passage in Scripture is Deuteronomy 17: “He who will be proud, refusing to obey the command of the priest who ministers unto the Lord your God in that time, that man will die by the decree of the judge, and you will take away evil from Israel.” This passage ought also to be understood concerning Christian bishops either by a similitude, or from the greater. For just as the Jewish people was then the people of God, so now the Christian people. We cannot say that an ecclesiastical prince in the New Law ought to be of lesser authority than the priests in the Old Law were, since in the former we see all the greater and more august things. Nevertheless, the precepts of the Jewish priest were true commands, not admonitions or encouragements, as is clear from the words: “the command of the priest,” and they obliged the conscience. Otherwise transgressors would not have been severely punished. If they who did not obey the precept of the Priest did not in fact sin then they would seem to have been killed for no reason.

Our adversaries respond, from this and similar passages that can be gathered, that those men who condemn their superior sin in conscience, because they refuse to obey due to pride. Hence it does not follow that they sin in conscience when they do not keep such laws on indifferent things short of contempt and scandal.

But we have especially, at least in the Pope, true authority to command that is of the kind that a political prince has; the very thing that the Waldenses, Marsilius of Padua and others denied. Next, from this we evidently deduce that the laws of the Pope oblige in conscience, even without regard to contempt and scandal. Whoever can command can also make an indifferent act necessary by his precept, and good in itself; to omit

an act that is necessary and good in itself is to sin in conscience even without regard to contempt and scandal.

We prove the proposition. An indifferent act, if it is commanded, will now be necessary; otherwise it is commanded in vain. And this same thing is proven from the fact that it would follow that even the positive laws of God do not oblige in conscience. For why did circumcision oblige the Jews, and Baptism us, when they ought to be acts that are indifferent in themselves? Does not the fact that they are commands of God make them necessary acts of religion? Likewise, why were the Jews obliged in conscience to not eat pork to the extent that the Maccabees would prefer death to eating that meat, if the matter of pork were indifferent? Would it not be that because it is a precept of God abstinence is a necessary act of temperance? But God did not do this insofar as he is God, but insofar as he is the law-giver. Therefore every true law-giver (even one who commands in the name of God) can do this same thing. But the Pope can command, as we have already shown, and will also show again below therefore he can make an indifferent matter necessary and oblige in conscience, even without regard to contempt and scandal.

The second passage is Matthew 16. "Whatsoever you will have bound on earth will be bound in heaven." These words can and should be referred to all things that are said to be "bound" according to the use of Scripture. Generally, when the Lord speaks, he does not say: "Whatever you will have bound." We discover, however, in Matthew 23:4 that the word "to bind" means to impose a law: "They bind heavy burdens that cannot be lifted and place them upon the shoulders of men, but they refuse to move a finger to help them." Therefore, the Lord promised to Peter that whatever he will have bound, that is, some obligation he would impose upon the faithful by command, should be bound in heaven, in other words it will be valid there. The precept of Peter is, consequently, the precept of Christ, and one who does not comply sins. It is confirmed by the testimony of Jerome commenting on the words *Whatever you will have bound* in Matthew 18:4, "He granted power to the Apostles to understand who is condemned by such things; the human judgment is fortified by the divine."

The third passage is John 21:17, "Feed my sheep." There, when Christ shows Peter what he promised in Matthew 16:18, he uses royal vocabulary, *poi maine ta probatmou*.

The fourth passage is John 20: “Just as the Father sent me, so I send you.” Chrysostom says on this passage: “He left behind his ministry to them.” Likewise, Theophylactus says: “Take up my work.” Thus, the Lord left behind his place to the Apostles and willed that they would exercise authority by governing in his kingdom. This is also confirmed from that which is written in Luke 10: “He who hears you, hears me, but he who spurns you, spurns me.” Cyprian [602](#) and St. Basil [603](#) teach that these words properly pertain to the Apostles and their successors. Moreover, Christ was sent from the Father with power, not only to preach and administer the Sacraments, but also to command and judge, as everyone affirms; consequently he himself granted the same thing to the Apostles, and especially Peter. One cannot respond to this that these words were said to all the Apostles together, but not as individuals, since the Apostles were soon going to separate from each other and journey to different parts of the world, and the Lord was not ignorant of that. Hence, without a doubt, what he gave to all, he meant to give even to separate individuals.

The fifth passage is Acts 15. There, Peter, along with the other Fathers of the Council, writes to the Gentiles converted to the faith: “It seemed to the Holy Spirit and to us to impose no further burden upon you beyond what is necessary: to abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, from fornication, and from strangled meat and blood.” [604](#) Here, the Apostles made a new law, as Chrysostom remarked, because Christ gave no precept concerning suffocated animals and blood, nor are these good or evil in the law of nature, but indifferent, such things that the heretics teach the Church cannot make necessary.

Moreover, the fact that this was a true law of the Apostles obliging men in conscience (at least in that time in which they lived), is proven: 1) because the Apostles call them burdens when they say, “to impose no further burden.” 2) Because they say, “beyond what is *necessary*.” For that reason it necessarily had to be observed as constitutions of the Church that must be kept—and not freely, as the heretics would have it. 3) Luke absolutely calls these precepts at the end of the chapter, when he says that Paul “went through the cities and commanded them to preserve the commands of the Apostles and of the elders,” [605](#) as well as in the next chapter, “They handed down to them decrees to be kept, which had been

decreed by the Apostles and the elders in Jerusalem.” [606](#) 4) We see from the testimony of St. John Chrysostom that he says, “See this short epistle having neither arguments nor syllogisms, but commands,” [607](#) since it was the legislation of the Spirit.

Next, because in the canons of the Apostles, can. 62, the heaviest penalty is imposed upon those failing this precept; for eating blood or suffocated animals clerics were deposed while the laity were excommunicated. That was renewed in the Second Council of Arles, can. 19 and 20. But so atrocious a penalty cannot be imposed unless it is for mortal sin.

Calvin responds that the Apostles commanded nothing new with this law, but only that what was always a precept of divine law, for no one to offend by giving scandal to the weak in the eating of food either sacrificed to idols, mixed with blood, or from a suffocated animal. Hence Christians were not obliged in conscience to abstain from these things, but only not to scandalize anyone. [608](#)

Calvin also tries to show this in three ways: 1) The scope of the apostolic decree was to free the Gentiles from the yoke of the Jewish ceremonial law; consequently, they would overturn this decree if they obliged them to the same ceremonies. 2) This precept was not kept, because the reason of scandal ceased; therefore, only scandal was prohibited by this precept. 3) Paul, who was present at this Council of the Apostles, and understood this matter the best, so explained it in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10, that it is not illicit to eat food sacrificed to idols, unless the weak would be scandalized. He says in chapter VIII, “Some still think of such meat as something belonging to idolatrous worship when they eat it, having a false god in their mind and their conscience, being weak, is defiled. ... See to it lest perhaps your liberty might become a stumbling-block to the weak. If anyone sees one with more knowledge sit to eat meat in the temple of an idol, will not his conscience, being uneasy, be emboldened to eat those things which are sacrificed to idols? And will the weak brother perish, for whom Christ died, due to your knowledge?” [609](#) And in chapter 10: “But if someone says ‘This has been sacrificed to idols, it is a matter of conscience and he that told you not to eat it. I say conscience, meaning not your own, but the other man’s.’” [610](#) But this epistle was written after that Council of the Apostles, as is clearly gathered from the Acts of the Apostles, because Acts 15 relates the Council,

next Acts 18 tells first of Paul's entry into the city of Corinth. Furthermore, it is certain that this epistle was written later than Paul preached to the same Corinthians. For he said in chapter 2: "And when I came to you, brethren, I came not in the grandeur of speech, etc."

Still, this is easy to refute. For even if the end of the Apostolic precept was that the weak should not be scandalized, still that precept did not end in the avoidance of scandal, but on abstinence from burnt offerings, blood and suffocated animals, which was the means to that end. In the same way the end of all divine precepts is charity, and still those particular precepts to not steal and kill do not oblige one to love, but they do oblige a man to keep his hands off another's goods as well as not to harm another. And although the reasoning of each law, as the lawyers say, might be the spirit of the law; generally, when the reasoning for it should cease then the purpose of the law also ceases, hence the law ought to be abrogated and cease. In any event, when the reasoning of the law does not cease, except in some particular case, the law is still valid; when it is general, it obliges all even in that case when the reason or purpose of the law cannot be discovered. The law of fasting proves to be a perfect example.

The purpose of fasting is the castigation of the flesh against the spirit of concupiscence; therefore, when this reasoning will universally cease, which will be after the resurrection, the law on fasting will also cease. Yet at the present, although the purpose of this law may not have place in one case or another, still these are held to fast because the law is still in force and is general.

Moreover, the matter still stands in this apostolic law on meat immolated to idols, blood and suffocated animals. Firstly, Chrysostom says this is the new law, and taken from the ceremonial precepts of Moses; but to not scandalize is an ancient precept, and a moral one; therefore it is not scandal, but specific foods that were prohibited by the Apostles. Secondly, in the whole decree of the Apostles there was no mention of avoiding scandal, yet it is absolutely commanded that they should abstain from meat sacrificed to idols, blood and suffocated animals; so the precept falls upon these three. Otherwise it would be lawful to overturn all laws, even divine ones.

Next, the Fathers thus understood this precept of the first churches. For Tertullian, in his *Apologeticus*, says: "We do not even have blood in our meals, on that account we abstain also from suffocated animals and those found dead, lest they might be contaminated with blood, or have it buried in

their entrails. Next, among the trials of Christians are even sausages filled with blood, for it is certain they are altogether illicit for them.” [611](#) Note here that Tertullian does not say Christians abstain from blood on account of scandal, but lest they be contaminated. Certainly they thought blood was unclean, though not by their nature (as the Manicheans thought) but on account of the apostolic prohibition, just as many animals are said to be unclean because they are forbidden.

Note also the fact that the pagans, knowing that it was unlawful for Christians to eat blood, tried to compel them to eat it. From this it is clear that Christians simply thought that blood was prohibited to them by the Apostles, not simply on account of scandal of the horrified Jews. There could be no scandal when the pagans tempted them, for the pagans freely fed upon blood.

Likewise, Origen, [612](#) disputing on forbidden foods, says that Christians abstain from meat immolated to idols, blood and suffocated animals by the prescription of the Apostles; yet he makes no mention of scandal to the Jews. St. Cyril of Jerusalem also says: “Confirm your soul for certain, lest you might eat what has been offered to idols.” There, Cyril disputes on foods and says that meat and wine are indifferent, and can be rejected well or wrongly; indeed rightly if it was done on account of the maceration of the body, or another good end, but wrongly if it was done from the opinion that meat and wine might be unclean. But where he comes to that which was immolated to idols, or blood and suffocated animals being forbidden by the Apostles, he places no distinction but absolutely teaches they must not be eaten, because without a doubt they were simply illicit by apostolic precept.

Eusebius relates that when the pagans objected to Christians, because they secretly ate the flesh and blood of infants, the holy martyr Blandina responded: “You err very much, O men, in that you think they eat the flesh of infants, who do not even eat the blood of silent animals.” [613](#) In such words, St. Blandina indicated that Christians would not use blood even secretly where there was no occasion of scandal.

St. Augustine asks the question, whether a traveler overcome with hunger, if he discovered nothing else but food in the service of idols, where there is no other man, ought he rather die of hunger than eat that food? He responds: “Either it is certain that it was sacrificed to idols, or it is not, or he

does not know. If it is certain, it is better for a Christian to reject it for the sake of virtue, but if he does not know, or is ignorant, without any scruple of conscience in the use of necessity he eats it.” [614](#) But certainly, in this case what St. Augustine proposes leaves no place for scandal, and Augustine still judges that it is better to abstain from meat sacrificed to idols. His reason seems to be no other than the authority of the apostolic precept. It is similar to what St. Leo the Great writes, where he says that those must do penance who knowingly eat meat which was immolated to idols, or even did it from fear of force, or compelled by the necessity of hunger. [615](#)

Next, the Council of Gangra says (cap. 2) that they have no hope of salvation who eat the meat that was immolated to idols, as well as blood and suffocated animals, while those who eat other meats maintain hope of salvation. It cannot in any way be explained that those who do eat these foods should not because of scandal, because even those who eat any meat and any other food, but give scandal to others, sin. The Apostle says, “Wherefore, if meat scandalize my brother, I will never eat it, lest I should scandalize my brother.” [616](#) Therefore, we have an apostolic precept that truly obliges in conscience, even without regard to scandal.

Now I respond to the first argument of Calvin, to not oppose the obligation of this precept with the scope and end of that decree. For the Apostles decreed that the Gentiles ought to be free from the observance of the Mosaic law, but not from obedience to their prelates. Furthermore, this precept on the abstinence from meat immolated to idols, blood and suffocated animals was not imposed as from the law of Moses, but as apostolic and ecclesiastical. Besides, the Apostles freed Christians from the observance of innumerable ceremonies. They commanded only one thing, and an easy thing, and to endure for a short time.

To his second argument I say the reason that precept is not observed now is not because the reason of scandal has ceased in every possible way, but because it ceased in general and now (especially in the West), that law was abrogated.

To the third, some respond that in that time in which St. Paul wrote that epistle, the apostolic law began to be abrogated, and for this reason Paul advised the Corinthians that they may eat from meat offered to idols, but should avoid scandal, but this reason is not solid. For it is not in any way

credible that such a law could so quickly be abrogated, especially when still in that time the reason on account of which the law was broadly imposed was still present. Nay more, that this law endured for many centuries is clear from the many cited authorities.

Therefore, I respond in two ways. 1) Perhaps in that time in which Paul wrote to the Corinthians, the precept of the Apostles had not yet come to the Corinthians on abstinence from meat offered to idols, blood and suffocation. For the Apostles only wrote to the churches of Syria and Cilicia. Thus he begins his epistle: "The Apostles and elder brothers to those who are at Antioch, Syria and Cilicia from the nations, greetings." But Corinth is not in any of those places, which are in Asia, but in Greece. Besides, if the Corinthians had the apostolic precept on abstinence from meat offered to idols, I ask, would they have sought a letter from Paul on whether it was bad to eat such meat? What they asked is clear from 1 Corinthians 8. Thus, I say that the Corinthians did not have this precept at that time. Since they had not received it from the Council of the Apostles and since Paul knew they were very superstitious he showed it was still not expedient to hand this down to them. So, instead he gave them a response which one should have according to the law of nature, that they were not held to such abstinence except by reason of scandal and danger to the weak.

2) I also respond that perhaps the Corinthians had the precept of the Council of the Apostles and just the same some of them, trusting in their own knowledge whereby they knew idols were nothing and hence they could not be infected by food offered to idols, rashly ate from such. This was related to Paul, and he wrote back chiding them and giving the reason of that Apostolic precept, because without a doubt he rightly forbade the use of meat sacrificed to idols, and on account of the danger of idolatry. Therefore, the whole disputation of Paul is treated not on precept, but on the reason for the precept. Nor does it follow that Paul said that meat immolated to idols was not bad in itself, except for scandal and danger, therefore if scandal was not present, nor danger, then they could lawfully partake. I say this does not follow. For although it would not be bad, unless on account of those two causes, still they could absolutely forbid it. For many lawful things are forbidden lest they drag us down to illicit things, and in that prohibition these are absolutely illicit.

The sixth passage is Romans 13:1-2. "Let every soul be subject to higher powers; for there is no power but from God and those that are, are ordained

of God. For that reason, he that resists the power, resists the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.” This passage is not only understood concerning secular princes but also ecclesiastical ones. What Calvin declares is manifest from this, [617](#) since the Apostle speaks in general on all powers when he says, “For there is no power but from God,” because they are equal in that all power is from God. Moreover, the same Apostle Paul teaches that there is some ecclesiastical power, and Paul teaches the same thing in 2 Corinthians 13:10, “I write these things while I am away so that when I will be there I will not deal more severely, according to the power which the Lord has given me.” And although Paul speaks in the literal sense on the secular powers, still in a similar fashion, the same thing must be understood on the greater, which is ecclesiastical power.

That their laws are provided with power and oblige in conscience is clear from the words “he that resists the power, resists the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.” Everyone shows this to be on a damnation that is both temporal and spiritual, such as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylactus, Ambrose and even the Calvinist Peter Martyr himself commenting in this passage. Likewise, from the verses, “Therefore it is necessary to be subject,” that is, this is not free, but necessary, and from: “Not only on account of wrath, but even on account of conscience.” In other words, necessarily you must obey, and understand that not only on account of fear of punishment, but even on account of fear of sin which you incur with the witness of conscience.

Now what Chrysostom, as well as Theophylactus and Oecumenius who followed him, understood about conscience in this passage is not opposed to what we have said since they speak of conscience of good deeds. This is, as it were, necessarily that one must obey princes not only because of anger, that is, their retribution, but also on account of conscience, because you are aware of the many benefits you receive from kings. This, I say, is not opposed, for the common exposition is on the conscience of sin, as Theodoret, Ambrose, Bede, Anselm and others say on this place of Scripture, as well as Augustine; [618](#) and our adversaries, both Calvin and Peter Martyr, receive the same exposition. And the Apostle always receives this term (conscience) in this sense.

Yet, Calvin responds to this that the obligation of conscience, about which the Apostle speaks here, does not refer to the individual laws of princes but to the general precept of God in which we are held to honor princes and also the purpose of their laws, that is, peace and love of neighbor. [619](#)

Yet, we especially showed above that it clearly follows from this that we are held to obey superiors, because we are also held in conscience to keep their laws, even short of contempt and scandal. Next, when the Apostle says: “Be subject from necessity, not only because of anger, but also on account of conscience,” certainly what extends to “on account of anger,” also extends to “on account of conscience.” Moreover, “on account of anger,” the Apostle extends, not only to avoid contempt and scandal, but even to the observance of laws in particular. For a prince not only punishes one who scorns his laws, but even those who do so in particular; for he kills a thief by hanging, and punishes a murderer by cutting off his head. He commands forgers to be burned, even if it was not from contempt of the prince, rather it is certain they sin from the lust for money. Consequently, for the same reason (but on account of conscience), that ought to be extended to the violation of laws. For Paul did not say be subject from necessity, not only on account of anger in the observance of particular laws, but on account of conscience in the observance of a general command concerning not scorning the prince, but simply and without any distinction he joins the two: “Not only on account of anger, but also on account of conscience.”

And besides, that it is wicked to disdain and scorn a superior is so clear that it was not necessary for St. Paul to drive this point home so often in as many words. Therefore, he teaches so that there could be no doubt among Christians on the matter; they are also held in conscience to observe the precepts and laws even of temporal princes, as Chrysostom and other interpreters rightly remark.

The seventh passage is 1 Corinthians 4, where Paul says: “What do you want? That I should come to you with the rod, or in a spirit of meekness? Here with the word “rod” Chrysostom, Augustine, [620](#) and all other interpreters of this place understand as the power to punish sinners. For Christ, as king of the Church, has the rod, which in Psalm 2 is called the “iron rod,” because it is inflexible, and in Psalm 44 (45) it is called the rod

of direction, which is a Hebrew phrase meaning the straight rod, because it punishes justly. But he shares this rod with the bishops who rule the Church in his name. Therein, St. Augustine reconciles a certain contradiction that appears in Matthew and Mark. In Matthew 10, he gives a command to the Apostles that they not bear the rod. Mark 6 says that he commanded them that they should bear it. Augustine reconciles these so that Matthew speaks on the corporal rod, but Mark on the spiritual one, that is on the apostolic power, on account of which sustenance ought to be given to the Apostles by the people. [621](#) Just as taxes are due to a king on account of the royal rod, so tithes are due to the bishop on account of a similar rod.

Peter Martyr responds to this argument that while certainly the Church has the rod to punish, still it is not in one particular man, like the Pope, or a bishop, but in the body of the Church. [622](#) For Paul, in 1 Cor. 5, means that a certain incestuous man was to be killed by the ecclesiastical rod when he said: "When you are gathered, my spirit is with you," etc.

But the same Peter Martyr says in the same place that the Apostolic rod also pertained to the death of Ananias and Sapphira, the blinding of Elymas and similar punishments that the Apostles afflicted. Yet certainly, only Peter slew Ananias and Saphyra by his word, and only Paul blinded Elymas, not the body of the faithful, who did not even give counsel. Besides, only Paul handed him over to Satan, that is, excommunicated him, and permitted Alexander and Himenaeus to be vexed by the devil, as he himself says in 1 Tim. 1:20. He also says in 2 Corinth. 13:10, "I forewarn you that if I will come again, I will not spare," and: "That I will not do it any harder in person, according to the power which the Lord gave me."

Certainly the rod and power are the same, and Paul affirms that he was given the power, not the body of the faithful. I omit the fact that Ambrose excommunicated Theodosius by himself, and we can advance countless examples of this sort.

That verse, "When you are gathered," is not opposed to this, for Paul did not mean that they should gather so as to deliberate, or that this incestuous man ought to be excommunicated, but that the excommunication would be published publicly and solemnly. Solemn excommunications are conducted in the same manner; when some men are excommunicated by name, they are not imposed except in the presence of the Church, but still they are imposed by the authority of the prelate alone. For this reason even while

Paul was absent and without a vote of the Church, he had already decreed the man be handed over to Satan, and he writes to the Corinthians, not counseling them in this matter, but commanding them, that with the Church gathered they might promulgate that excommunication.

The eighth passage is 1 Timothy 3:2, where the Apostle established a law that men who married twice should not be ordained. Such a law obliged in conscience, even if it was clearly positive and ecclesiastical law, for it is clear both from the practice of the Church, which never dared to ordain the twice-married, and from the Fourth Council of Carthage, [623](#) where a bishop, who knowingly ordained a twice-married man, was seriously punished with deprivation of the authority to ordain.

The ninth passage is 1 Timothy 5: “Do not receive an accusation against a priest unless it is made with two or three witnesses.” Here the Apostle clearly teaches that the bishop should have his tribunal even outside the forum of conscience, and to hear accusations and proofs in the fashion of judges as well as to judge according to testimony and proofs. Chrysostom reasonably understands by the word *presbyter* any elder you like, whether priest or laity. From that we gather that even the laity are judged in the external forum by a bishop for some crimes. But Ambrose understands by this term a priest, and perhaps more correctly. Nevertheless, this exposition does not exclude the laity from the forum of a bishop but very clearly includes them. For the Apostle means (as Ambrose shows) that the accusers of the laity are more easily admitted and can be heard, but against a priest, on account of the dignity of the order, it ought not be done unless two or three witnesses are present. Apart from these there are many other passages less to the point, but that still have efficacy.

The tenth is Luke 10:16, “He who hears you, hears me,” which Cyprian teaches is properly understood about bishops. [624](#)

The eleventh passage is 1 Corinthians 11:2, “I praise you because you keep my precepts,” and 1 Thessalonians 4:2, “You know what precepts I have given you.” And in the same place: “If anyone will not obey our word, mark this man through by epistle, and have nothing to do with him.”

The twelfth passage is Hebrews 13:17, “Obey those placed in charge of you, be subject to them, for they keep watch as they are going to render account for your souls.” Chrysostom, writing about this passage, says that it is better not to have one in charge than to have one, and to not obey a

superior because he has none, for he only suffers the loss of pastoral direction; but for one who has a superior and does not obey him, he suffers the same loss and also sins and will be punished by the Lord. Basil says the same thing explaining that in this passage the Apostle added: “For it is not useful to you,” that he might show the serious loss as well as sin and punishment which comes upon those who do not obey their superiors. [625](#) For in the Greek text it is not put in the negative (it is not expedient for you), but in the positive, that it is harmful, *alusiteles gar humin touto*. So, Basil interpreted what it is harmful or detrimental as the punishment due for the fault of transgression.

Thus we conclude the Scriptures. Now in the second place, it is proven from the tradition of the Fathers as well as from the fact that there is almost no council that does not command something, or forbid under penalty of anathema, or deposition. For equal reason, the epistles of the Popes are full of precepts and censures that can be read either in the volumes of councils or in the body of canon law. Above, [626](#) we also brought to bear particular passages from the epistles of the ancient Pontiffs, Leo I, Gelasius, Hilary, Anastasius and Gregory I. Therefore, passing these over, we advance the testimony of the Fathers, only on one ecclesiastical law which the heretics especially condemn, and what we will prove for that one will be the same proof for all the others.

Therefore, that the law of fasting during Lent, or on Ember Days, or vigils is clearly positive and ecclesiastical law our adversaries affirm, but all the Fathers teach the fact that it obliges the faithful in conscience even without regard to contempt. Canon 68 of the Apostles bids a cleric to be deposed and a layman to be excommunicated if he would fail to observe an appointed fast. Likewise, the Council of Gangra, can. 29, bids those who absolve men from the appointed fasts without necessity to be excommunicated. Also, the 8th Council of Toledo, can. 9, deprived those who violated the fast of Lent of Holy Communion on Easter and commanded them to abstain from meat for a whole year. Here we must notice that the council did not speak of contempt, but rather of those who do not fast from intemperance.

St. Basil says: “All, equally, both hear and receive the precept with joy. ... See lest you incur damnation due to a little desire for food, and make yourself guilty of the crime of a turn coat.” [627](#) St. John Chrysostom,

says, “When the season of fasting arrives, even if someone will exhort a thousand times and countless things may torture and compel him to take a little wine or taste something which is forbidden by the law of fasting, he should prefer to suffer all these things rather than taste forbidden nourishment.” [628](#) And in homil. 2 on Genesis he says that Lent bends everyone’s conscience—even that of the emperor—to obedience.

St. Ambrose says: “It is no light sin to violate the Lent appointed for the faithful, and to break the holy fasting by the voracity of his belly.” [629](#) St. Jerome says: “We fast according to the tradition of the Apostles in a time that is not agreeable to us. There is no time through the whole year except in Pentecost that it is not lawful to fast, but it is on the one hand a necessity, on the other a duty of the will to offer it.” Note the word: *necessity*. St. Augustine says: “On other days it is a remedy to fast, or a recompense, but in Lent it is a sin not to fast.” [630](#) Pope Leo the Great said: “It is pious to do what is not appointed, but impious to neglect what has been decreed.” [631](#)

Next, Epiphanius [632](#) and Augustine place Aërius among the heretics for the reason that he said that one must fast, but not because of a precept of the Church, but whenever it pleases. Aërius says (quoted in Epiphanius): “Fasts must not be commanded because this is Jewish and under the yoke of servitude, for the just law is not placed upon anyone. But if one altogether fasts from the will, and I may choose any such day for myself, then I will fast on account of my liberty.” The same speech is customary for the Lutherans.

In the third place, the case is made from reason. Some true laws are necessary to govern the Church well, apart from divine and civil laws, for every true law has coercive force. Consequently, coercive ecclesiastical laws are necessary in the Church, but there are not, nor ever were in the Church ecclesiastical laws other than those which the Supreme Pontiffs (or councils confirmed by the Popes), published; consequently, the laws of Popes and councils of this kind are coercive laws and truly and properly oblige in conscience. But the proposition must be proved, and the assumption of the first syllogism, for upon that everything depends.

Thus, that some ecclesiastical laws are necessary can easily be proven. By the same reasoning in which laws are necessary for the Church, so they

are also for the state. The reason why laws are necessary in every state is because men ought to live according to reason so that they might live well, and still, because they are composed of body and spirit, and reason and sense, they can scarcely be without affectation following the lead of reason alone. For that reason, laws are discovered which contain nothing but the judgment of reason, that when men are compelled to follow them they are compelled together with reason to follow them. Now this reasoning has place in the Church. Although Christians are freed from sin by the grace of Christ, still they are not freed from concupiscence and the passions that perpetually oppose reason.

You will say that Christians have the law of the Gospel to follow. I respond: They certainly have that, but that is very broad and insufficient to direct all of our actions, except that it be done through determinations of ecclesiastical rulers in some mode of a particular. In the same way, the state also has the natural law and yet, because that is too general, it does not suffice unless it is deduced to particulars through determinations of the prince.

For that reason, to the extent that civil laws (being like conclusions deduced from natural law) are necessary, so also in the Church ecclesiastical laws apart from the law of the Gospel are necessary since they are like conclusions deduced from the principles or determinations of the Gospel. For example, the Gospel says: “He who would minister to me, let him follow me.” [633](#) There, the Church deduces as a conclusion that it will be useful to ratify a law, lest they might be admitted to sacred ministry who refuse to be continent. Likewise, the Gospel bids the Eucharist to be received but it does not determine how or when; accordingly, the ruler of the Church determines that it must be taken at least during Easter, and the Apostles made a law that it should be taken before all other food, without a doubt while fasting. Hence Augustine says: “He [the Lord] did not prescribe the order in which it was to be observed, since he reserved this for the Apostles through whom he intended to arrange all things pertaining to the Churches.” [634](#)

Now it remains that the assumption be proven, namely that every true law is coercive. This is proven from natural law itself, since a law is a certain rule over human actions constituted either immediately or mediately by God. To deviate from the rule is to sin. This is why Aristotle says: “Law

is a discourse set out from some prudence and mind, having the force to compel.” [635](#) Therefore, the essence of a law is placed in this, that it should bind and compel, so that it would be a sin to do otherwise. Likewise, what the definition of sin shows, for what is a sin but the transgression of law? For sin is thus defined by the Apostle, *hamartia estin hē anomia*. [636](#) Nor can it be said that a law does not oblige one to not scorn it. For a law, which obliges one not to scorn a prince, is a certain general and divine law. But this, on which we are treating, is a particular and human law, as when the Pope says that fasting during Lent does not oblige you to not neglect a superior, but to fast.

CHAPTER XVII: The Arguments Advanced by Our Adversaries from the Testimony of Scripture Are Answered.

IT REMAINS to answer the arguments. 1) They take the first from the last chapter of Matthew: “Baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to keep all things which I have commanded you.” Here our adversaries note, that it was not said teaching *your* commands, but *mine*. Thence, they gather that it is not lawful for bishops to give commands. This is the argument of John de Wessalia. I respond: In those things which the Lord commanded is included obedience to the commands of prelates, for the Lord said: “He who hears you, hears me, etc.”

2) It is said in Deuteronomy, “You will not add to the word which I speak to you, nor will you take from it.” [637](#) The issue in this verse is ceremonial precepts, as well as judicial ones. For in the verse just before this one, it begins with: “Listen, O Israel, to commands and judgments.” And in chapter 12: “These are the precepts and judgments, etc.” If God already commanded the Israelites that they should add no precept to those which are in the Scripture of the Old Testament, would one not correctly suppose that it commands Christians all the more not to add anything to the Gospel, which is by far more perfect than the Old Testament? This argument Luther, Calvin and nearly all others make. And Peter Martyr thought it was so good that in the commentary on chapter 8 of 1 Corinthians, he wrote in the margin: “Note, a good argument.”

I respond: addition or subtraction in regard to a precept can be understood in two ways. In the first, that which is added is a precept to a precept, so that if two other precepts were added to the number of ten, or if two precepts were taken away from the number of ten, that would make twelve or only eight. In the second way, it is done without the multiplication of more or fewer precepts than the precept itself may command, e.g., if

when God commanded families to eat one lamb at the Pasch, some family were to eat two lambs, or only a half. Therefore, I say that Scripture does not prohibit the addition of the first type, but it does of the second type, that is, it does not forbid an addition to the number of precepts, but an addition to the work of a specific precept. I prove the fact, because we discover that the Jews added to the number of precepts both ceremonially and judicially.

On ceremonial additions there are many examples. For Esther says, “Mordochai wrote that on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the month of Adar they should receive the fourteenth and fifteenth day of the month Adar for holy days, and always at the return of the year should celebrate them with solemn honor.... The Jews took upon themselves their seed, and all who would join them in their religion, so that it would be lawful for no one to spend these two days without solemnity.” [638](#) Likewise Judith, in the last chapter, “The day of this victory is a festival for the Hebrews in the number of their holy days, and the Jews have venerated it from that time even into the present day.” [639](#) Likewise 1 Maccabees: “Judas decreed, along with his brethren and all the assembly of Israel that the day of the dedication of the altar should be observed from year to year for 8 days.” [640](#) Such a feast, although new and added to the old, the Lord still honored with his presence, which is clear in John 10:22.

On judgments we have the example of 1 Kings, where David made a new law that it would be just in war for those going down to the battle to remain with the baggage train: “And this came to pass,” it says in the Scripture, “from that day it was constituted and determined just as a law in Israel.” [641](#) Now, that it says “as a law” is not opposed to what we are saying, for in Hebrew it does not say “as a law” but only *le-taq ul mishpat* (an authoritative judgment), and those two words are also contained in Deuteronomy 4 and 12. Therefore, the Scripture does not forbid new precepts to be added but prohibits the adding or taking away on one’s own authority. This is confirmed by Deuteronomy 4 and 12, where Moses does not speak of princes, whose job it is to make laws, but the people, who must obey; therefore, he only commands that which is fitting to be commanded of the people, namely that they should fulfill completely the works that were commanded, not by adding or by subtracting. Moses more clearly explains this in Deuteronomy 5, where he says on the same issue: “Do those

things which the Lord God commanded you, and do not turn to your right or to your left.” For it is certain here that Moses speaks on the fulfillment of precepts, not on the impositions of new laws.

Moreover, it must be observed in this place that when Moses commands that nothing is to be added to what the law prescribes, this must be understood on an addition that corrupts the law, not one that accomplishes the work that was commanded. For when the law says: “You will not steal,” one who does not abscond someone else’s things but also gives from his own does more than what the law commands. Still, it is not said he added, because he did not destroy the precept; rather, he kept it better. But when the law says you will only sacrifice clean sheep, oxen and birds, if anyone would also sacrifice dogs, pigs and men, he adds to and corrupts the precept. And this example is placed in Deuteronomy 12 where addition is forbidden, lest anyone might sacrifice their sons as the Gentiles did.

Moreover, we can answer with a second argument. Even if we were to admit the Scripture forbids an addition of new laws, nevertheless, this prohibition should be understood only on the addition of laws contrary to the prior laws, as St. Thomas profitably teaches, [642](#) and it is clear from the laws added later, as we have already shown.

A third argument can also be made, that the plan of the Old and New Testament is not the same. For the law of the Old Testament was given to only one people, at a certain time, even to the coming of Christ; it could easily determine all things for an individual, just as it did. In individual cases it prescribes all things which both pertain to the worship of God as well as judgments and public contentions. And therefore it would be little wonder if it forbade other laws from being added. But the Law of the Gospel is given to the whole world, that is, to peoples of very different nations, and it is going to endure even to the end of the world. Hence, it cannot determine all things concerning each individual with such ease that other laws would not also be necessary, both civil and ecclesiastical. The same laws and rites are not suitable to a very diverse people. So, God judged it better that in the Gospel he would hand down what was common to all as the most common laws on the Sacraments, articles of faith and the like, while other more special cases for the diversity of times and places he left to be established by the Apostles and their successors.

3) Calvin takes up an argument from Isaiah 33:22 where we read, “The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king.” These words are equivalent to the Lord is our only Judge, Lawgiver and King, which is certain from the epistle of James: “There is one legislator and one judge; it is he who can destroy and set free.” [643](#)

I respond: Isaiah and James speak on the primary legislator who can judge and make laws by his own authority; but we do not say the Supreme Pontiff is such an authority, but rather God and Christ alone. The Pope is not the king, nor the judge, nor the primary legislator but the vicar of the king and judge, that is of Christ the legislator, and he can make laws on Christ’s authority. St. Cyprian also speaks this way when he says that the Pope is the judge in place of Christ. [644](#)

Yet, you might argue that when James says, “There is one legislator and judge, who can destroy and set free,” he gives the reasoning why all men ought to keep the laws and not give them. Hence he excludes all other legislators since they would oblige consciences, punish sinners and save the obedient. For he says in the previous verse: “Do not detract from one another. For whoever detracts from his brother, judges his brother, and detracts from the law and thus judges the law.” That is, he who detracts from a brother doing a good, like one who condones injuries, “detracts from the law,” which commands that good: “If you judge the law, you are not a maker of law, but a judge. For there is one Legislator, and Judge who can damn and save.” There it is understood in one proposition after those words: “But if you judge the law, you are not a maker of law, but a judge,” certainly you ought, O man, to be a maker of law, not a judge. And the reason is added: “There is one Lawgiver, and Judge.”

I respond: James speaks about all men, insofar as they are under some laws, and he means no man is allowed to judge the law of his superior when in fact only the latter is a legislator and judge that is so supreme and distinguished that only he should give laws but not receive them. It is he who can so destroy and save, and consequently he fears no one and does not hope for something from anyone. Hence the Pope, and the other bishops, although they judge and can impose laws, still they must also be judged by God and must keep the laws of God.

4) Calvin takes up a fourth argument from Isaiah, “For that reason this people glorifies me with their mouth and their lips, but their heart is far

from me, and they fear me in the commands and doctrines of men, behold I will add to it; I will see to it that admiration shall be in this people by a great and resounding miracle; their wise men shall lose wisdom and understanding shall be hidden from their prudent men.” [645](#) There the Lord complains because the people of Israel fear the commands of man, that is, the fear or worship and religion of God they constituted in commands to be kept by men. Similar things are contained in Matthew 15 and Mark 7.

I respond: The commands of men in Scripture are not called mere precepts of men, but only those which are altogether human, meaning that they were constituted neither from God’s command, nor inspiration, nor his authority in any fashion. Such are two-fold: a) Some contrary to divine commands; b) Some altogether vain and useless. That is clear from all the citations where precepts are called human law, such as Isaiah 29, Matthew 15, Mark 7, Coloss. 2, 1 Timothy 4, and Titus 1. Moreover, the Lord is found three times to have condemned the Pharisees for human traditions. Firstly, in Matthew 15 where he argues with them because they preserved human commands contrary to the Divine Law. For after he said that the Pharisees commanded that sons should give to the temple what was due to the care of their parents, he added, “You make void the law of God on account of your tradition,” then adding the passage cited in Isaiah. This is why St. Irenaeus explaining these citations, says they must be understood on the precepts of the Pharisees against divine laws. [646](#)

Secondly, in Mark 7, he condemns traditions or commands of men, that is, certain useless and frivolous ceremonies proceeding merely from a human spirit, which the Jews did so much, that they placed them before divine commands. In other words, leaving behind the commands of God you hold traditions of men, the baptism of jugs and chalices, and you do other things similar to these.

Thirdly, he condemns the same things in Matthew 23:3, because they had made certain good laws out to be more important than the divine law. There, he does not call these laws precepts of men, but says it is fitting to do them rather than omit them. They only sinned in that they constituted those ceremonies as the chief point of religion although they were merely external. What they did was similar to the dog of Aesop, who on account of the shadow of the bread left behind the bread itself, as Irenaeus beautifully

alludes to concerning the Valentinian heretics, who preferred a certain angel as creator, instead of God. [647](#)

Next, pontifical and ecclesiastical commands, although they can be called human because they are not immediately from God, still are never called “traditions of men” in the Scriptures. Furthermore, they cannot be condemned when they do not oppose divine commands; they are not useless, nor do we place these ahead of divine law, rather we say they ought to be placed second to divine precepts.

5) They take up a fifth argument from the words of Paul, whereby it is asserted that Christians are free from the laws of men. In 2 Corinthians 3:3, he says: “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.” And Galatians 4:31 “We are not the sons of the maidservant (Hagar), but of the free woman (Sarah), in such liberty Christ freed us.” And again: “Stand and do not again be bound under the yoke of servitude.” [648](#) *I respond:* Christian freedom is constituted in three ways. Firstly, in the freedom from the servitude to sin, whereby Paul says in Romans: “Freed from sin, you are slaves to justice.” [649](#)

Secondly, in the freedom from the servitude of the divine moral law. For the law cannot be fulfilled without grace and still it threatens a penalty unless it is fulfilled, and moreover, it presses and holds men just as slaves. Yet the grace of Christ frees us from that fear and servitude, not by freeing us from the obligation of fulfilling the law, but by inspiring us with charity whereby we may easily and joyfully fulfill the law. The Apostle speaks of this in 2 Corinthians when he says: “Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom,” [650](#) and again in Galatians: “Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” [651](#) For this reason, Augustine says: “We are not under the law which indeed commands a good but still does not give it, rather we are under grace which, making us love that which the law commands, is able to command the free.” [652](#)

Thirdly, in the freedom from servitude to the ceremonial and judicial precepts of the Mosaic law. This is said in Acts: “Why do you tempt God by placing a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, etc.” [653](#) And Galatians: “Stand and do not again be bound by the yoke of servitude.” [654](#) We

never read, however, that we are freed from obedience to prelates, but rather the contrary, when Paul exclaims: “Obey those placed over you.” For this reason, Peter and Paul, foreseeing in spirit the heretics of our time who under the pretext of freedom bear neither the fasts appointed by the Church nor any other law it imposes, frequently drive home that we must be obedient to superiors, even to the pagans. Let us show this: “Be subject to every human creature on account of God; ... Just as free men who do not have liberty as a veil of malice.” [655](#) Next, Peter speaks on heretics, “Promising them freedom when they are in fact servants of corruption.” [656](#) Then Paul says, “You are called to freedom, but do not give an occasion to the flesh by that freedom.” [657](#)

CHAPTER XVIII: The Argument is Answered by a Comparison of Laws.

WE CONTINUE with the arguments of our adversaries.

W 6) If God meant for Christians to be free from Jewish ceremonies and other positive laws of the Old Testament, then he also meant from the ceremonies introduced by the Popes and from all other human laws. For if we ought to have positive laws then divine laws excel human laws; besides, we would gain no benefit but harm by that liberation from the Jewish law, since those laws are called “an unbearable burden,” by St. Peter, [658](#) both on account of their multitude, and on account of the obligation under pain of sin. Otherwise these individual matters in themselves were not grave, nor unbearable. On the other hand, positive laws of Christians are ten times more than were those of the Jews, as is clear from examining the volumes of canon law, [659](#) and the volumes of councils, with the Mosaic Pentateuch. Therefore, if all these laws oblige under pain of eternal punishment it would be far better for us to have the laws of Moses.

Calvin confirms his argument with the testimony of St. Augustine, who complains about ecclesiastical rites introduced rashly, saying, “They so oppress the very religion which God wished in his mercy to free [men] from servile burdens in the fewest and most manifest Sacraments by way of celebration that the condition of the Jews would be more tolerable since, even if they did not recognize the time of freedom, still they were subjected to legal burdens rather than human presumptions.” [660](#) Calvin also adds: “If this holy man lived in our time, would he not deplore this with such complaint, which is now servitude? For the number is ten times greater, and individual points a hundred times more rigid than were driven out at that time. So it usually happens where once these perverse legislators seize control, there is no end of command and prohibition, until they arrive to the end of pedantry.” [661](#)

I respond: Christ wished us to be free from the ceremonies and judicial precepts of Moses because these ceremonies were figures of the New

Testament; hence, they ought to cease in our present reality. Moreover, the precepts pertained to the rule of the people of God according to their state; for that reason after that state was changed, it was necessary for the precepts to be changed, “Since the priesthood has been transferred,” says the Apostle in Hebrews, “it is necessary that for the transference of the law to happen.”

662 It does not follow that we ought to have no civil and ecclesiastical laws, if we do not have the law of Moses.

Now to that argument about the number and weight of the Popes’ laws, I respond: pontifical laws are, without any comparison, lighter than those of the Mosaic law. Hardly any laws can be discovered that are imposed upon all Christians except for four: 1) To observe feast days; 2) To observe fasts; 3) To go confession once a year; 4) To go to communion during the Easter Season. All the rest, in which the volumes of councils and books of canon law are full, are either not laws but admonitions, or pious institutions without obligation under penalty of sin. A great many of the rites of Christians are of this sort. Unless it were done out of contempt, nobody sins who does not recite the Hail Mary three times a day, or who does not take a palm branch on Palm Sunday, or sprinkle themselves with holy water when they enter a Church, or who does not strike their breast at the elevation of the holy Eucharist etc., and still, these and like things Calvin decries as a burden to the Church. There are also conditional laws, those that are placed upon men who wish to be admitted to Holy Orders, such as celibacy, which do not burden the Church, since no man is bound to become a cleric or a monk. Some rules are not prescribed for all Christians, but only ecclesiastical judges, so that they would follow these prescriptions in the judgment of cases. Some of these are censures and penalties imposed upon those who violate divine law, without which there is no other way to preserve discipline. There are also explications of dogmas of the faith, either of divine law, which do not even impose a new burden upon Christians. But the Mosaic law was imposed upon every individual Jew; they were innumerable on purifications, sacrifices, the eating of foods, etc. Therefore, it is not fitting to compare the Pentateuch with volumes of councils and the books of canon law, but with a small Catechism, since a Christian can be saved if he only knows a small Catechism.

Now for what deals with the gravity of laws, there is also no comparison between the severity of the Jewish law and levity of ecclesiastical law. From our four laws, there is not one which would not be rather more a

determination of divine law than an altogether new law. For we are held by divine law to dedicate some time to the worship of God, and at some time to fast, confess and communicate. Therefore, the Popes have merely determined the times; hence if there is some difficulty in these laws it should be referred to divine law instead of the law of the Popes and especially regarding the precept of confession, which is held to be the hardest of all. Indeed, the confession of sins is hard for some people, not because it ought to be done at such and such a time, but simply because it has to be done at all. There is no doubt on that fact.

Next, the determination of the time of feasts and fasting done by the Popes has the mildest obligation. For they are not obliged to fast unless they can, for which reason children, the old and sick are excepted. Likewise, we are held to abstain from servile work in feasts as well as to hear Mass, but with many exceptions, for they ought not cease necessary work or those disciplines of great advantage to men, such as the trade of doctors, apothecaries, cooks, etc. For equal reason those who are impeded by a just cause and not present at Mass are not judged to have sinned. But the Jews were so very severely held to be idle on the Sabbath that they could not even light a fire or cook food—even a man that merely gathers wood on the Sabbath was stoned at God's command.

Now, I speak to Augustine. Calvin means to maliciously abuse his words, for he does not complain about the rites established by Popes, but about certain particular customs of common and unlearned men that little by little obtained the force of law, such that when they rose too much, they ought to be abolished and abrogated by the authority of bishops. He says: "Where the authority is granted, I think without any doubt that all things that are not contained in the authority of the Holy Scriptures, nor discovered in the statutes of councils of bishops, nor fortified by the custom of the universal Church, but vary so innumerably in the diverse customs of diverse places that hardly can any reasoning ever be discovered which men followed in establishing them, these must be pruned and cut back. For although how they are against the faith may not be discovered, still religion itself, which in the fewest ..." then the rest as above.

Therefore, you see that Augustine altogether meant to keep the laws that bishops established in councils, or that the custom of the universal Church had fortified and even all those of the kind we call ecclesiastical laws. For they would not be preserved in the volumes of councils or in the volumes of

canon law unless they were from bishops, but I know of no private laws imposed broadly by ordinary men.

CHAPTER XIX: The Argument Taken from Examples is Answered.

WE CONTINUE with the arguments of Calvin.

W 7) He takes this argument from three examples, which are contained in the Scripture. 4 Kings (2 Kings) 16:11 relates the deed of Achaz the King and Uriah the high Priest, who added one altar to another in the temple. Although it seems that he did that to adorn the temple, still because God did not command this, it was condemned as a human invention. Next, in chapter 17:24-26, it is related that those whom the King of Assyria had brought from Babylon into Samaria were punished by God by having lions sent in among them because they worshiped God with new ceremonies that the Lord had not commanded. Next, in 4 Kings 21:3, it is related about King Manassah, that he especially sinned because he built altars in the temple, which the Lord had not commanded.

I respond: The impudence of Calvin here is admirable. For when he teaches that Achaz, Manassah and Babylonians sinned in that they established ceremonies that God had not commanded. In reality the Scripture clearly says that all of these men sinned because of idolatry. Truly, Achaz is condemned, not because he built a new altar in the temple, but because he raised an altar to the likeness of the altar of idols which were then in Damascus, [663](#) and because he not only removed the altar of the Lord from its place, but also refused to allow sacrifices to be offered on the altar of the Lord, rather they could only be offered on the new altar consecrated to an idol.

Furthermore, that it would not have been bad to raise another altar in the temple, even if the Lord had not commanded it is clear from 3 Kings where we read that Solomon, when he saw the bronze altar of the Lord did not hold all the holocausts which were offered, sanctified another place in the temple, and there also offered holocausts. [664](#) For God neither commanded Solomon to do this, nor condemned him. It must be said that he rather approved of it, since in the following chapter he appeared to Solomon in a dream and praised him, promising many good things to him.

Next, it is certain that those Babylonians who lived in the region of Samaria were idolaters. For the Scripture thus speaks in 4 Kings, “And when they began to dwell there, they did not fear the lord and the Lord sent lions among them that killed them. ... Each nation made its god, and placed them in high temples ... And when they worshiped the Lord, they also worshiped their false gods according to the custom of the Gentiles that were brought over into Samaria.” [665](#) Thus, the Scripture condemns the sin of idolatry that they practiced in those citations, not that they worshiped God with new ceremonies.

CHAPTER XX: Two Arguments of Calvin from the Notion of Conscience Are Answered.

CONTINUATION of Calvin's arguments.

A 8) The eighth argument of Calvin is that Paul in no way permitted the faithful to consciously be reduced to the servitude of men. For he says in 1 Corinthians, "You are bought for a price, do not become slaves of men." [666](#) There, Paul does not command that slaves not obey their masters in exterior things, for in Ephesians 6 he says: "Slaves, obey your human masters with fear and trembling." [667](#) Nor does he command lest those who are free not be made slaves, for he also says, "Have you been called a slave? Do not be troubled, but even if you could be free, use [the opportunity] more." [668](#) That is, even if you could be free, it is better for you that you serve and use your servile condition to preserve humility. Therefore, it remains that he forbade them to serve men with fear of sin as well as to be anxious for their conscience, in the way that they must serve God alone.

I respond: In that place, Paul only commands that we do not serve men on account of their being men, rather on account of God, so that we might serve God in those men, rather than the men themselves. For Paul explains himself in Ephesians, "Slaves, obey human masters with fear and trembling, in the simplicity of your heart, just as Christ, serving not by appearance to please men, but as servants of Christ doing the will of God from your heart, serving with good will just as it were the Lord, and not men." [669](#) Therefore, they are made slaves of men (which the Apostle forbids) who have human respect and serve them, even if they command sins and flatter them, even when they act wrongly. See Chrysostom in I Cor. 7, as well as Jerome's commentary on Ephesians 6.

9) The ninth argument of Calvin. Conscience pertains to the forum of God alone. For he is the one who scrutinizes hearts and minds. Consequently, men cannot oblige in conscience. This argument is confirmed

by the fact that a man cannot damn anyone to hell, as a result he cannot oblige him to keep a law under penalty of eternal death. For it would be ridiculous were anyone to oblige under a penalty they could not inflict.

I respond: Conscience that pertains to the forum of God alone can be understood in two ways. 1) Because only God can see the consciences of men and judge on their internal actions, which are not clear on the outside nor have other witnesses than God and the conscience of the agent; in this way it is quite true that the conscience pertains to the forum of God alone. 2) It can be understood that conscience pertains to the forum of God alone, because clearly only God could bind men with such laws that if they would not do what has been commanded, he himself would judge that they have done wickedly by their own conscience. And in this mode it is false that the conscience does not pertain to the forum of men. It is not required for someone that would oblige another in conscience in this manner that he be able to see the conscience, nor that he search hearts and minds, nor be judge over internal actions. It is enough that he can legitimately command him and by commanding him thus, oblige him to carry out an external work so that if he would not do it, he would certainly understand, or certainly could understand that he acts badly.

Therefore, John Calvin is deceived in the equivocation (or desires to deceive others) when he speaks in this way: "The business of our consciences is not with men, but with God alone. Hence the common distinction between the earthly forum and the forum of conscience. When the whole world was enveloped in the thickest darkness of ignorance, it was still held like a small ray of light which remained unextinguished that conscience was superior to all human judgments. Although this, which was acknowledged in word was afterwards violated in fact, still, God was pleased that there should even then exist an attestation to liberty, exempting the conscience from the tyranny of man." [670](#)

But when we say that conscience is superior to all human judgments we mean nothing other than that a man who is well aware of himself ought not to fear that God will damn him, even if all men who do not see his heart judge otherwise concerning his affairs. To what end? For that reason, shall a man not sin who violates ecclesiastical laws by the testimony of his conscience?

I respond in the affirmative; human law does not oblige under the penalty of eternal death, except insofar as by the violation of human law God is offended. His ministers are princes, not only ecclesiastical, but also political; whoever transgresses the laws of a viceroy consequently offends the king and can be punished by the king, even by the kind of penalty that a viceroy perhaps could not inflict. Likewise, a man that does not keep the just laws of princes also offends God and is punished by him with the eternal penalty of death since princes are indeed also ministers of God.

[671](#) Therefore, if we were to pretend that God is not in the nature of affairs, those who will violate just laws will also sin in conscience, but will neither offend God, nor will they be condemned to hell.

You will say: If that is so, it follows that human law inasmuch as it is human, does not itself oblige that transgressors should be said to sin mortally. I respond: if by a human law, inasmuch as it is human, you mean a thing that is not properly divine then I deny that a transgressor of human law, inasmuch as it is human, does not sin mortally. But if a human law, as human, you would understand that which a man imposes by an authority not received from God, but conferred on his own authority or that of men alone, I affirm that transgressors of such a law do not sin mortally. A law of this sort is null. For all true power is from God, [672](#) and without true power no true law can be made.

CHAPTER XXI: An Argument from the Fathers is Answered.

WE NOW proceed to arguments from the Fathers.

W 10) The tenth argument is taken from several testimonies of the Fathers that Juan Torquemada refers to by name. [673](#) The first is of Origen who, while explaining Matthew 20, “The kings of the nations lord it over them, with you it is not so,” says: “Just as carnal matters are placed in necessity but not in the will, so the spiritual things are in the will, not in necessity, so even spiritual princes. Their rule ought to be placed in love of their subjects, not in corporal fear.” [674](#)

I respond: Origen does not exclude from ecclesiastical rule coercive power, but only advises princes of this sort about their duty. For there is a difference between a secular and ecclesiastical prince, because the secular prince has for his temporal end also the external peace of the state; therefore his end is attained when his subjects live in peace, whether they wish to, or against their will. The spiritual prince, however, has for his end eternal life and external peace which is internal for his subjects, and for that reason he ought to altogether procure that his subjects are rather more led by love than by fear, although where he cannot command that they live joyfully and from love, he also ought to apply coercive force, at least from fear of penalty not to disturb the external peace of the Church. For this reason, Gregory says: But towards their subjects there ought to be in the hearts of rulers both mercy giving comfort in justice, and justice dealing wrath with pitifulness.” [675](#)

The second is St. John Chrysostom, where he compares the Pope with a pastor of irrational sheep and says: “For it is not possible to doctor all men with the same authority with which the shepherd treats his sheep. For in this case it is also necessary to bind and to restrain them from food, and to use cautery or the knife; but the reception of the treatment depends on the will of the patient, not of him who applies the remedy.” [676](#) And he also says:

“For Christians above all men are not permitted to forcibly correct the failings of those who sin. Secular judges indeed, when they have captured malefactors under the law, show their authority to be great and prevent them even against their will from following their own devices; but in our case the wrong-doer must be made better, not by force, but by persuasion. For neither has authority of this kind for the restraint of sinners been given us by law, nor, if it had been given, should we have any field for the exercise of our power, inasmuch as Christ will give them an eternal crown who abstain from evil by their own choice, not of necessity.”

Juan Torquemada responds that Chrysostom speaks on those who are outside, that is the pagans, whom the Church cannot compel to the faith. But Chrysostom also speaks clearly on the sheep who are within, and who are consigned to the bishop. Therefore, it must be said that Chrysostom never meant to deny the coercive power of the Pope when he eloquently asserts this. For in homily 70, to the people, he forbids Christian subjects to call certain foolish women to themselves, who are usually put out to weep at funerals, and says: “Lest I would compel them to weep over their true and proper evils ... Were we not heeded, God forbid we would be compelled to go from threats to serious business, castigating you with ecclesiastical laws, such as will correspond to the threats; ... Nobody will despise any ecclesiastical bonds. For he who binds is not a man but Christ who conferred this power to us, and constituted us masters of such an honor.” And in Epistle 1 to Pope Innocent, he asks him to compel Theophilus, the bishop of Alexandria as well as others by ecclesiastical laws, since they had expelled him from his see unjustly. And in homily 83 on Matthew, speaking to priests he says: “If any general or consul you like were adorned with a diadem but should be present unworthily, confine and compel him. You have greater power than they do, but if you dare not to drive them out, you ought to speak with me for I will not permit such a matter to pass.” Therefore, we see that Chrysostom sensed prelates can bind their sheep and drive them out of the Church and severely punish them, which he seemed to deny beforehand.

Next, I respond to those words in two ways. Firstly, this distinction between the shepherd of irrational sheep and rational ones was placed by Chrysostom so that when he treated on the natural sickness of the sheep, he could heal the sheep even if they refuse; but when he treated on that voluntary sickness of the sheep, he cannot cure it unless they wish, and

therefore, the latter is more, difficult than the former. I say it is likewise in regard to the secular power. For a secular judge treats on external actions, and therefore can compel a man against his will so that he will change his manners, but it is certainly external; yet a bishop treats on internal manners, which cannot be changed against the will of one who has them. For even if the bishop can excommunicate and inflict other penalties, still these things are of no profit unless he who is punished should be willing. I understand those words of Chrysostom in this way since authority of this kind for the restraint of sinners has not been given us by law, but the bishop does not have the authority to compel men to change their heart, just as a judge has to compel a man to change his external manners. Secondly, it can be said on this citation that Chrysostom deals with the priestly power in the forum of conscience. There we cannot correct the penitent unless he wishes to be corrected; the chief thing we can do is to dismiss him without absolution.

The third testimony is of St. Augustine, where he defines sin in this way: "Sin is called either a deed or coveting against the eternal law of God."

[677](#) From this it is deduced that the transgression of human law is not a sin. It is also similar to the definition of Ambrose: "Sin is a prevarication of divine law." [678](#) I respond: Every sin is against the law of God, not the positive law, but the eternal, as Augustine rightly teaches. For every justly enacted law, whether it is given by God or by man, is derived from the eternal law of God. There is, moreover, an eternal law that it is evil to violate a rule.

The fourth testimony is of St. Bernard: "Those who say this will not show, I believe, where anyone of the Apostles you like sat as a judge of men. I read that they stood to be judged; I do not read that they sat in judgment." [679](#) I respond: St. Bernard speaks on judgment in civil cases. For otherwise he says in the same place: "Why do those who will judge angels in heavenly matters not think so little of judging about little earthly possessions of men? Therefore, your power is over crimes, not over possessions. Because on account of the former, not the latter, you received the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Add the fact that Bernard did not dispute whether it was lawful, but fitting, for the Pope to judge on earthly lawsuits.

CHAPTER XXII: The Last Question Is Proposed: Whether Christ Conferred Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction Immediately to the Supreme Pontiff, and to Him Alone?

THE LAST question remains concerning the derivation of ecclesiastical power from the Supreme Pontiff to the other bishops. It must be known that there is a threefold power in the Pope and the other bishops: 1) of order; 2) of interior jurisdiction; 3) of external jurisdiction. Of these the first refers to the confecting and administration of the Sacraments; the second to ruling the Christian people in the interior forum of conscience; the third to rule the same people in the exterior forum.

On the first and second there is no question on our side, but only on the third, since the first point is certain among all authors, that bishops, and the Supreme Pontiff himself, have the power of order equally and immediately from God, since it is conferred through a certain consecration that works in the same measure in one man and in another. [680](#) On the second point there is some dissent among the authors, for Abulensis thinks this power is conferred to all priests immediately by God when they are ordained. [681](#) But just the same, not simply any priest can absolve any Christian, or bind them, that is a fact; because to remove confusion, the Church divides dioceses and subjects one people to one bishop, and one bishop to another. But Torquemada teaches that this power is not conferred by God from the force of ordination, but by man through a simple command; still both authors agree in that the use of this power depends upon external

jurisdiction and therefore it will be enough to treat on that external jurisdiction. [682](#) Besides, the first two powers pertain properly to the matter on the keys of the Church, which we shall not dispute in this place.

Therefore, only the third has to be argued wherein we also treat on the above questions. And indeed they are all fitting in that the jurisdiction of bishops is at least in general by divine law. For Christ himself so arranged the Church that in her there would be pastors, teachers, etc. The Apostle says this, “He gave some to be Apostles, some prophets, others pastors and teachers.” [683](#) And besides, unless that were so, the Pope could change this order and institute that there would not be any bishop in the Church, something he certainly cannot do. But the question is whether bishops canonically elected would receive their jurisdiction from God, just as the Supreme Pontiff does, or on the other hand from the Pope. Moreover, there are three opinions of theologians on this matter.

1) Of those who would have it that both the Apostles and the remaining bishops received and do receive jurisdiction immediately from God. Francis Victoria [684](#) and Alphonse à Castro [685](#) teach this.

2) Of those who would have it that the Apostles received jurisdiction not from Christ but from Peter, and that bishops do not receive jurisdiction from Christ, but from the successor of St. Peter. Torquemada [686](#) supposes this as does Dominic Jacobatius. [687](#)

3) The third is the middle of those two and would have it that the Apostles indeed received all their authority immediately from Christ, while the bishops do not receive it immediately from Christ, but from the Supreme Pontiff. For this opinion are Cajetan, [688](#) Domingo de Soto, [689](#) Francis Vargas (in a little book on this very question), Hervaeus, [690](#) and Gabriel; [691](#) and the same seems to be the opinion of the old Scholastics, St. Bonaventure, St. Albert and Durandus, as well as others commenting on book 4 of the Sentences of Peter Lombard, distinction 18, or 20, and even 24; which is the truest opinion, and therefore must be briefly confirmed.

CHAPTER XXIII: The Apostles received all jurisdiction from Christ.

HEREFORE, the fact that the Apostles received their jurisdiction immediately from Christ is witnessed: 1) from the words of the Lord in John 20, “Just as the Father sent me, so I also send you.” The Fathers, particularly Chrysostom and Theophylactus, explain that by these words the Apostles were made vicars of Christ; nay more, they even received the duty of Christ and His authority.

St. Cyril adds on this passage that the Apostles were properly created as such by these words, as well as teachers of the whole world, so that we would understand that all ecclesiastical power is contained in the apostolic authority; therefore, Christ added, “Just as the Father sent me.” Accordingly, the Father sent the Son provided with supreme power. St. Cyprian says, in his book *De Unitate Ecclesiae*: “The Lord says to Peter, ‘I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ and after the resurrection he said to the same: ‘Feed my sheep.’ And although he gave equal power to all the Apostles after his resurrection, and says: ‘Just as the Father sent me, even I send you,’ still, to manifest unity, he constituted one chair, etc.” There you see the same thing is given to the Apostles through the words: “I send you,” because it was promised to Peter through that promise, “I will give you the keys,” and after it was fulfilled through that command, “Feed my sheep.” It is certain, however, through the former “I will give you the keys,” and through the latter “feed my sheep” that the fullest jurisdiction is understood, even external. But how this does not impede the primacy of Peter, we have shown often enough elsewhere.

2) The election of Mathias into the apostolate shows the same thing. For in Acts I we read that Mathias the Apostle was not elected by the Apostles, nor was any authority given to him, but after the election that which they implored and prayed through divine agency, soon he was numbered among the Apostles. Certainly if all the Apostles had jurisdiction from Peter, he ought to have shown the fact especially in the election of Matthias.

3) It is proven from Paul, who expressly teaches that he had authority and jurisdiction from Christ, and this is what he uses to prove himself a true Apostle. For in Galatians I he says: “Paul, an Apostle not by men, nor

through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.” And in the same passage, to show he did not receive authority from Peter or the other Apostles, he says: “When it pleased him who separated me from the womb of my mother, he also called me through his grace, and I did not right away acquiesce from flesh and blood, nor did I come to Jerusalem to those who were Apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia, and again went back to Damascus. Next after three years I came to Jerusalem to see Peter, etc.” And in Chapter 2: “Those who seemed to me to be something, conferred nothing.”

4) It is proved by the evidence of reason. The Apostles were constituted such by Christ alone, as is clear from Luke 6, “He called his disciples, and he chose twelve from them, whom he called Apostles,” and in John 6, “Did I not choose you twelve?” Moreover, the fact that the Apostles have jurisdiction is clear both from the deeds of Paul, who excommunicates [692](#) and everywhere constitutes laws, [693](#) and because the Apostolic dignity is the first and supreme dignity in the Church, as is clear from 1 Corinthians 12 and Ephesians 4, “And some he placed in the Church, first Apostles, then prophets, etc.” [694](#) Moreover, the fact that before the passion of Christ they were Apostles, but still were not bishops or priests, nor had any jurisdiction is not to be marveled at. The Lord conferred various powers upon the Apostles at various times. And in John 20 he especially finishes what he had begun before the passion.

CHAPTER XXIV: All Bishops Receive Jurisdiction from the Pope.

WE ARE going to prove the fact that all ordinary jurisdiction of bishops comes down immediately from the Pope.

1) From a figure in the Old Testament. In Numbers we read that when Moses could not rule the whole people alone, God commanded seventy elders to be present and taking from the spirit of Moses, he gave to them that together with him they would rule the people. Here it must be noted with Augustine, [695](#) that this taking of the spirit from Moses does not mean a decrease of the spirit in Moses, because then it would not have benefitted Moses to have helpers if on that account he was made weaker. Rather, it means the derivation of the power of the elders from the power of Moses. For God wished to show that the whole authority resided in Moses, but if others were to have something, they had it from Moses. Moreover, it is certain that the Pope has the same place in the Church that Moses had among the people of the Jews.

2) The ecclesiastical government is a monarchy, as we showed above, consequently, the authority is in one and is derived from him to others. For all Monarchies are constituted in this way. They respond that ecclesiastical government is monarchy, but it is tempered by aristocracy. Therefore, apart from the monarch there are also other lower prefects, who are not vicars of the monarch, but absolute princes. For they would be vicars only if they received their authority from him.

But on the contrary, the aristocracy of the Church requires also that bishops must be princes and not simple vicars; yet it does not require that these princes would be instituted by God and not the Pope, but only that the Pope is compelled by divine law in various parts of the Church to constitute diverse ecclesiastical princes. It works just as if the king should be held to not constitute governors or presidents in one place or in some province but true dukes and princes, who would rule their province but still have their dependence on the king.

3) It is proved from four similitudes, which Cyprian uses in his book *The Unity of the Church*, where he compares the see of Peter to the head, root,

font, and sun. In every body the strength of the members is derived from the head, in every tree the strength of the branches arises from the root, and in every river water flows from the font, and last of all the light of the rays is from the sun.

4) Fourthly it is proven from the inequality of jurisdiction. For if God immediately confers jurisdiction on bishops then all bishops would have equal jurisdiction, just as they equally have the power of order. For God did not ever determine the jurisdiction of bishops, but only that one bishop should have one city, another should have hundred cities, another should have many provinces. Therefore, jurisdiction of this sort is not given by God, but by man. For that reason, one rules a great, while another rules a little people, because it so pleases the one that gave jurisdiction, that is, the prince of the whole Church.

5) If the bishops had their jurisdiction immediately from God, the Pope could not change it or take it away. For the Pope cannot do anything against the ordination of God; but it is certain what the Pope can do, and often has done. For this reason St. Bernard says: "The Roman Church can ordain new bishops wherever they have not been hitherto; it can reduce those who are and elevate others, according to what reason dictates, so that he may create an Archbishop from a bishop, and if it would seem necessary vice versa."

696

They respond that bishops have jurisdiction from God, but they are still under the Pope, and therefore, the Pope is permitted to abolish or change it.

On the other hand, the Apostles had power under Peter, and still because they had it immediately from Christ, Peter could not take it away or diminish it. Besides, they all have the power of the order of priesthood under the Pope, and still because they have that from God, the Pope cannot so take it away that they cannot use it if they wish. For even if he excommunicates a priest, suspends him, interdicts him or lowers him, still, if the latter wishes he could truly consecrate. Next, clergy and people in any city you like are subject to a bishop, and still if anyone from the clergy or the people has some authority immediately from the Supreme Pontiff, the bishop cannot abolish or diminish that authority. In the same way, if the bishops have their authority from Christ, then a vicar of Christ could not take that away or diminish it; or our adversaries should say that the Lord so

subjected the bishops to the Pope that he also meant for those things which he himself had conferred upon them to be able to be changed.

They respond: At least the Pope can take away from the bishop the matter subject to him, that is, subject his people to another bishop, and for that reason he does not properly take the jurisdiction given by God away from him, but causes that indirectly so as to destroy it. But when power of jurisdiction means a relation of prelate to subject, from relation to one placed or elevated, and on the other it is placed or taken away, if jurisdiction cannot be taken from a bishop, it cannot happen that the people would not be his subject. Next, it would be quite a wonder if divine providence, which sweetly disposes all things, would not allow jurisdiction to be given by him through whom he would wish it to be increased, diminished and also utterly taken away.

6) If the bishops have their jurisdiction from divine law then they ought to show something in the Word of God whereby this jurisdiction of theirs is founded. But they advance nothing, nor can our adversaries advance anything but the words of the Lord spoken to the Apostles, that to them is given the fullest jurisdiction in the Church by those words which certainly our adversaries do not concede to the bishops. Therefore, they see in what ground they defend their opinion.

7) Next we advance very serious testimonies of two Fathers and holy Popes. Innocent I, in his epistle to the Council of Carthage, which is the 91st among the epistles of Augustine: “The episcopate itself and the whole authority of this name emerged from Peter.” And in an epistle to the Council of Milevitanus, which is 93rd among the epistles of Augustine: “I think all our brethren and co-bishops ought not to be brought to any but to Peter, that is the whole authority of this name and honor.” St. Leo the Great: “If he wished there to be something in common with him and the others princes, whatever he did not refuse others he never gave except through himself.” [697](#) And Epistle 89, “The Lord so wished the Sacrament of this office to pertain to the duty of all the Apostles that in St. Peter the Apostle he principally placed the greatest of all, that some of his gifts would diffuse just as if from the head into the whole body.”

Furthermore, the fact that the Apostles did not receive jurisdiction from Peter is not opposed to our position, since here Leo speaks on the ordinary mode whereby God conferred to princes of the Church, that is the bishops,

their gifts and says they are conferred ordinarily through Peter. For the Apostles by an extraordinary privilege received their jurisdiction from Christ.

Last of all come the words of the Pope which he uses to create bishops. For he says: “We provide to the Church such and such a person and we put him in charge as a father, pastor and bishop of the same Church, entrusting to him the administration in both temporal and spiritual things, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.”

CHAPTER XXV: The Arguments of our Adversaries are Answered.

BUT on the other hand, our adversaries object: 1) That our opinion destroys itself. For bishops succeed the Apostles, as the Roman Pontiff Peter; therefore, if the Apostles have jurisdiction from Christ, as our first conclusion asserts, it also follows that bishops have from Christ what the second conclusion denies. And on the other hand, if bishops have jurisdiction from the Pope, as the second conclusion asserts, consequently, the Apostles have from Peter what the first conclusion denies. For the successor has from his jurisdiction from the one from whom the predecessor has it, otherwise he does not truly succeed but is instituted in another order. But St. Augustine teaches that bishops succeed Apostles for he explains that: “Sons are born to their fathers, the Apostles are sent; sons are born for the Apostles, they are constituted bishops.” [698](#) Moreover, the Council of Florence and the Council of Trent teach that bishops succeed in the place of the Apostles. [699](#)

I respond: There is a great difference between the succession of Peter and of the other Apostles. For the Roman Pontiff properly succeeds Peter, not as an Apostle, but as the ordinary pastor of the whole Church, and therefore the Roman Pontiff holds jurisdiction from the source whence Peter had it. But bishops do not succeed the Apostles properly speaking, because the Apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and just as delegated pastors they are not succeeded in such powers.

Still, bishops are said to succeed the Apostles, not properly in that mode whereby one bishop succeeds another, and one king another, but by a twofold reason. 1) First by reason of episcopal order; 2) Through the same similitude and proportion: because just as while Christ was living on earth the first twelve Apostles were under Christ, then the seventy-two disciples, so now the first bishops are under the Roman Pontiff, after these the priests, then deacons, etc.

But even for bishops to not otherwise succeed Apostles is proven, for they have no share of true apostolic authority. The Apostles could preach in the whole world, and found churches, as is clear from the last chapter of Matthew, as well as of Mark, but bishops cannot do this. Likewise, the Apostles could write the canonical books, as all affirm, the bishops could not do this. The Apostles had the gift of tongues and miracles; the bishops do not. The Apostles had jurisdiction over the whole Church and the bishops do not. Besides, one does not properly succeed unless he succeeds someone that precedes him, but the Apostles and the bishops were together in the Church as is clear from Timothy, Titus, Evodius and many others. Therefore, if the bishops succeeded the Apostles, which Apostle did Titus succeed, or Timothy? Next, the bishops succeed the Apostles in the same mode in which the priests do the seventy-two disciples, as is clear from Anacletus [700](#) and from Bede. [701](#) But it is certain that priests do not properly succeed the seventy-two disciples, except through a similitude. For the seventy-two disciples were not priests, nor of any order, but they received the jurisdiction from Christ. Accordingly, Philip and Stephen, and the five other deacons ordained by the Apostles in Acts 6 were from the seventy two disciples, as Epiphanius teaches. [702](#) Certainly they were not ordained Deacons if they were already priests beforehand.

Secondly, they object with the citation, “Attend yourselves to every flock in which the Holy Spirit has placed you as bishops to rule the Church of God.” [703](#) Likewise Ephesians 4, “He gave some Apostles, others prophets, others pastors and teachers.” There, by the name of pastors and teachers, bishops are understood, as Jerome says on that passage. It is also confirmed by the Fathers, for Dionysius says in the book *On Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, chapter 6, that the hierarchy of bishops ends immediately in Jesus, just as the lower orders of priests and deacons and others are ended in the bishops. Cyprian says that bishops are made by Christ, by whom the Apostles were created; [704](#) while deacons were instituted by the Apostles, and not by Christ.

St. Bernard also says: “You err if as the highest, you think only your Apostolic power was established by God.” [705](#)

I respond: To the first citation it can be said that bishops are constituted by the Holy Spirit not immediately, but mediately, because the Apostles

constituted them bishops by the inspiration of God and the power received from the Holy Spirit. But how in Acts 15 do they say: “It has been seen by the Holy Spirit, and us,” and still they speak on human law. Likewise Romans 13: “There is no power but from God,” certainly mediately or immediately.

To the second, I say there, the general order of the Church is expressed, without a doubt on divine law. For God is the one who established that in the Church there would be Apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers, even if he did not immediately give authority to all.

To the third, I say, Dionysius speaks on the order of bishops, not on their jurisdiction.

To the fourth I say, Cyprian meant the order of bishops established from Christ himself; hence (by divine law), it was introduced into the Church. But the order of deacons was first devised by the Apostles. The later part of the opinion some theologians of the School commonly reject, but whether it may be true or false, it does not avail to our proposition.

To the fifth proposition I say, Bernard speaks in that mode in which Paul speaks to the Romans when he says: “There is no power but from God.”

706

Thirdly they object that if bishops have jurisdiction from the Pope, consequently after the Pope dies the authority of the bishops would cease, just as all the limbs die when the head is cut off. I respond: There is a great distinction between the natural head and the mystical head. In fact, the members of the natural cannot be preserved unless they receive a continual flow from the head; but the members of the Mystical Body, especially the ministerial and external, depend upon the head that they should come into being, but still not that they be preserved. Therefore, once episcopal jurisdiction has been conferred, it is not lost when the one who gave it dies, but when the one who receives it dies, or when someone who is able should take it away.

Fourthly they object that to exercise the order of episcopacy, jurisdiction is necessary; for that reason, God who confers order, confers also jurisdiction. I respond: Both are conferred by God, but one immediately, the other mediately. 1) The power of order requires the character and grace, but only God can cause these; 2) jurisdiction only requires the will of a superior.

Fifthly they object that the Supreme Pontiff calls bishops *brothers and colleagues*, therefore they are put in charge of the Church by one common father. *I respond*: They are primarily called brother by reason of the episcopal order in which they are equals. Secondly, by reason of jurisdiction, because the bishops are raised up by the Pope to assist him in his burden, not to some lower ministry.

Sixthly they object that if all bishops ought to receive jurisdiction from the Pope then a great many bishops were not true bishops because the Roman Pontiff did not create all the bishops, especially in Asia and Africa.

I respond: It is not necessary that the Pope immediately create bishops, rather it is enough if it is done mediately, through patriarchs and archbishops. Therefore, from the beginning Peter constituted the Patriarch of Alexandria, as well as Antioch, who, receiving authority over the whole of Asia and Africa, could create archbishops, who afterward would create bishops.

BOOK V: ON THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE

CHAPTER I: A Question Is Proposed on Temporal Power.

ONLY the last part of our disputation on the Pope remains, which is on his temporal power where we discover three opinions of the authors. 1) That the Supreme Pontiff has the fullest power over the whole world from divine law, both in ecclesiastical matters as well as political. Augustine Triumphus teaches that, [707](#) as well as Alvarus Pelagius [708](#) and many lawyers, such as Hostiensis, [709](#) Panormitanus [710](#), Sylvester and not a few others. [711](#) Moreover, Hostiensis has another teaching, that through the coming of Christ all dominion of the princes of the infidels was transferred to the Church and resides in the Supreme Pontiff, so that as the vicar of Christ, the greatest and true king, namely the Pope, should he wish, can even give the kingdoms of infidels by his own right to some of the faithful.

2) The next opinion is on the other extreme and teaches two things: a) That the Pope, as Pope, has no temporal power by divine law and he cannot command any secular princes in any way; he may not deprive them of their kingdom or rule, even if they otherwise deserve it; b) This view teaches that it is not lawful for the Pope to receive the temporal dominion of other bishops, which they now have in some cities and provinces, whether they were given dominion of this sort or whether they usurped it. Divine law forbids the spiritual and temporal sword from being consigned at the same time. All the heretics of our time teach this, especially Calvin, [712](#) Peter Martyr, [713](#) and Brenz in his prolegomena against Pedro de Soto. The Centuriators of Magdeburg [714](#) place among the marks of Antichrist that the Pope bears two swords in all directions and they condemn this more than anything else among “the vices of the Popes”. [715](#)

The third opinion, which is in the middle, is common to Catholic theologians. The Pope, as Pope, does not have any temporal power directly or immediately, but only spiritually. Still, by reason of the spiritual power, he at least has indirectly a certain power and that is supreme in temporal

affairs. Henricus and the following writers think the same: [716](#) John Driedo, [717](#) Juan de Torquemada, [718](#) Albert Pighius, [719](#) Thomas Waldensis, [720](#) Peter de Palude, [721](#) Cajetan, [722](#) Francisco Victoria [723](#) Domingo de Soto, [724](#) and Nicholas Sanders. [725](#) What St. Thomas Aquinas thought is not so certain. For at the end of his commentary on the sentences he says that the Pope is the apex of both powers. Still, in his commentary on chapter 13 to the Romans, he says that clerics are exempt by privilege from the taxes of the secular powers, and he says that prelates can administer wars insofar as it is ordered to the spiritual good, which is the purpose of that power. [726](#) From this it is gathered that he does not think differently than other theologians. We therefore will treat three things. 1) We will show the Pope by divine law does not directly have temporal power; 2) That he has in some way, that is by reason of his spiritual monarchy, supreme power even in a temporal manner; 3) That it is not against divine law that bishops should also directly have actual temporal jurisdiction over cities and provinces given to them by kings, or otherwise acquired by just title.

CHAPTER II: The Pope Is Not the Lord of the Whole World.

WE WILL endeavor to prove three things in order. 1) The Pope is not the lord of the whole world. 2) That he is not lord of the whole Christian world. 3) That he is not the lord of any province or town, and has no jurisdiction that is merely temporal *by divine law*.

In the first place it is proven that the Pope is not the Lord of those provinces which the infidels obtained because the Lord consigned to Peter only his sheep. [727](#) Next, the Pope cannot judge infidels. “Why is it for me to judge those who are outside?” [728](#) Therefore, infidels are the true and supreme princes of their own kingdoms; for dominion is not poured out in grace, or faith, but in free will and reason. Nor does it descend from divine law, but the law of nations, as is clear from the fact that God approves the Gentile nations in both the Old and New Testament. “You are king of kings, and the God of heaven has given you a kingdom and dominion, etc.” [729](#) “Render to Caesar those things which are Caesar’s.” [730](#) Note, “render,” not give those things which are Caesar’s, that is, because they ought to be given by law. And in Romans 13: “Render all things due, tribute to whom it is due, a tax to whom a tax is due.” He commands in the same place to obey pagan princes on account of conscience. But certainly we are not held in conscience to obey someone who is not a true prince.

Therefore, the Pope is not the lord of those provinces that the infidels obtained and it follows that he is not the lord of the whole world, unless one would say that these provinces do not pertain to the whole world.

Our opponents will say, we are held to obey infidel princes, because all princes are vicars of the Pope. *Sed contra*, the Pope would not wish to have such vicars, even if he could freely give kingdoms of infidels to the princes of the faithful. Moreover it would be ridiculous for God to have given to the Pope rights over the kingdoms of the whole world and not to have given him any faculty of using a right of this sort.

But they will say that the Pope is the spiritual monarch over the whole world, and still he never could exercise this rule in the whole world. I respond: The Pope is called a spiritual monarch over the whole world, not because he is in charge of all men who are in it, but because he is in charge of all Christians diffused throughout the world. And again, even hypothetically because if the whole world would be converted to the faith, then the Pope would plainly be over the whole world in regard to spiritual jurisdiction.

They will add: But Alexander VI recently divided the world between the kingdom of Spain and Portugal. [731](#) I respond: He did not divide for the purpose that these kings should set out to make war upon all infidel kings of the new world and seize their kingdoms, but only that if preachers were to add them to the Christian faith they would protect and defend both those preachers and the Christians that they convert. At the same time, he sought to impede contentions and wars of Christian princes who wished to trade in those new regions.

CHAPTER III: The Pope is Not the Lord of the Whole Christian World.

INDEED, what was proposed in the second place, that the Pope is not the lord of the whole Christian world, is proved. First, because if the matter stood otherwise, as some would have it, then it ought to be certain from the Scriptures, or certainly from the tradition of the Apostles. We have nothing from the Scriptures except that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to the Pope, but no mention is made about the keys of an earthly kingdom. Likewise the Apostolic tradition advances nothing for the side of our adversaries. Besides, Christ did not take away, nor does he take away kingdoms from those who owned them; for Christ does not come to destroy those things that were good, but to fulfill therefore, when a king is a Christian, he does not lose the earthly kingdom which he lawfully obtained but acquires a new right to the eternal kingdom. Otherwise the good of Christ would be opposed to kings, and grace would destroy nature. It is also confirmed from a hymn of Sedulius, which the whole Church publicly sings:

O Herod, impious enemy,
Why do you fear Christ's coming?
He does not snatch up mortal things,
But gives heavenly kingdoms. [732](#)

In like manner, if the Pope is the lord of the whole Christian world, consequently, individual bishops are temporal princes in the cities subject to their episcopate. Accordingly, that which the Pope is in the universal Church, each bishop is in his particular one. But that bishops are lords of the cities of which they are bishops, our adversaries do not concede, and it is clearly false. For St. Ambrose says: "If it were tribute, what the emperor asks is not denied, the fields of the Church give tribute." [733](#) And in a

letter of St. Athanasius, treating on the solitary life, he quotes Hosius of Cordoba as saying to the Emperor: "God consigned to you rule, but to us Christ consigned those matters which are of the Church."

Next, it is proven from the confession of Popes. Leo affirms that the emperor Martianus was chosen by God to command [734](#) and also that his authority is from God. [735](#) He writes similar things in nearly all the epistles to Theodosius, and Martianus, while Leo's successors wrote the same in turn to their emperors. Pope Gelasius says in his epistle to the Emperor Anastasius, [736](#) "There are two things, O august Emperor, whereby this world is ruled; the sacred authority of Popes, and the royal power, etc." There it must be noted, that Gelasius does not only speak on the execution, but on power itself; and by authority (lest our adversaries might say the Pope does indeed have each power), rather demands execution from others.

St. Gregory the Great writes: "Power over all men of my lords was given from heaven for the sake of piety." [737](#) And Nicholas the Great clearly says: "Do not ask a precedent from the Church of God. By all means she bears no precedent to your rule ... The same mediator of God, and the man of men Christ Jesus, thus distinguished the duties of each power from the proper acts and distinct dignities of each, so that Christian emperors would need Pontiffs for eternal life, and Pontiffs would merely use imperial laws for the course of temporal matters." [738](#) Here, the Pope speaks not only on the execution but also on the power and dignity. And even if he were to speak on the execution alone, that would be enough for us. For whatever the emperors have, says Nicholas, they have from Christ. Therefore, I ask, can the Supreme Pontiff take away from kings and emperors this execution just as if he were supreme king and emperor, or can he not? If he can, then he is greater than Christ; if he cannot, then he does not truly have royal power.

Besides, Pope Alexander III was asked whether an appeal might be made from a secular judge to the Pope, and responded, "Indeed, those who are subjects of our temporal jurisdiction can, but we believe others cannot according to the inflexibility of the law." [739](#) Likewise he says, "We, being attentive to what pertains to the king and not to the Church, judge on such possessions, etc." [740](#)

Next, Pope Innocent III, speaking on authority and obedience, says: “To the firmament of heaven, that is, the universal Church, God made two great lights, that is, he established two dignities which are papal authority and royal power, but the former is in charge of the two, that is, the greater is in spiritual matters, the lesser rules carnal affairs. By the same difference that is understood between the sun and the moon, so also between Popes and kings, etc.” Note here, to the extent that the sun and moon are not the same, and just as the moon does not make the sun, but God, so also, the papacy and empire are not the same thing, nor does one absolutely depend upon the other. He says the same thing in another canon, [741](#) that the Pope only has full power in his temporal domains, but on all other accounts he does not have the same power outside of them: “Although the king recognizes no temporal superior, still he could submit himself to our judgment without injuring another’s right. It seemed to some that by himself, not as a father to his children but rather as the prince, that he could issue a dispensation to himself. You, however, know that you are subject to another and so you may not appeal to us and not at the same time injure them, unless first they would offer assent to us, nor could you grant such a dispensation yourself.”

[742](#)

CHAPTER IV: The Pope Does Not Have any Temporal Jurisdiction Directly.

NOW it remains that we show that the Pope is the temporal lord of no land by divine law. Moreover, it will be manifestly proven by this reasoning that Christ, as man, while he lived on earth did not receive nor wished to have any temporal dominion; but the Supreme Pontiff is the vicar of Christ, and represents Christ for us, and since Christ was of that sort while he lived among men then the Supreme Pontiff, as the vicar of Christ, should also be as Christ was and thus, has no temporal dominion.

Each proposition of this argument must be proven. 1) From the false principle (that Christ was a temporal king), two errors arise; from this they deduce, just as from a particular foundation, that the Pope, who is the vicar of Christ, is king and priest at the same time. On the other hand, the followers of John Wycliffe [743](#) deduce from this very same principle that kings are greater and more worthy than Popes, because kings are vicars of Christ the king, and Popes are vicars of Christ the priest. Moreover, Christ was more king than priest, for he descended from the royal tribe of Judah and the family of David, not from the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron. And hence, he was a king by hereditary succession, not a priest.

Therefore, so as to explain and prove this principle, I say Christ was indeed always (as Son of God), king and lord of all creation in the manner in which his Father is, but this is an eternal and divine kingdom; it does not abolish the dominions of men, nor can it fit the Pope. Besides, Christ as man was the spiritual king of all men, and had the greatest spiritual power over all, both faithful and infidel alike in the order of eternal salvation, so that he could oblige them to receive faith and his Sacraments. After the day of judgment this spiritual kingdom of Christ is going to come into being; it will also be sensible and manifest and so the glory of this kingdom, even as the glory of this kingdom began in Christ our head when he rose from the dead.

In other respects, this is not a temporal kingdom, such as of our kings, nor can it be shared with the Pope because it presupposes the resurrection. Next, Christ the man could (if he had wished), have obtained that he be seen to receive royal authority but he refused and hence did not receive it. He also did not have either the execution of dominion and rule, or the power of any temporal king. That fact is proven, for if he had such it would either be from hereditary succession, election, the right from war, or a special gift of God. For every king acquires his kingdom from some of these ways, either heredity, election of the people, right of war, or the gift of one higher.

Christ as man did not have a hereditary kingdom. For although he descended from the royal family, still it is not certain whether he was closer to David than many others who were from the same family. Besides, at that time, God willed that the kingdom be taken from the family of David; he also foretold this from the family of Jechonia whence Christ descended, [744](#) that there was never going to be a king, certainly not temporal, in the way in which David and his successors had been. In Jeremiah we read about Jechonia: “Thus says the Lord, write that this sterile man is a man who will not prosper in all his days. For there will not be a man from his seed who shall sit upon the throne of David, and have power beyond Judah.” [745](#) It is also certain from Matthew that Christ descended from this Jechoniah.

It follows from this that Christ could not have temporal rule by hereditary succession, unless the prophecy which had foretold the matter with eloquent words were false, that no man ever had power in Judah from the line of Jechoniah; nor can it be responded that his posterity had the right to rule, still from the fact that he did not sit on the throne of David. For to what end is a right that no one ever used? Furthermore, it is confirmed from the Fathers. Jerome, commenting on this passage, as well as Ambrose, [746](#) asked how this prophecy of Jeremiah is not opposed with the prophecy of the Archangel Gabriel in Luke 1, when he says, “The Lord God will give him the throne of David his father.” They responded that it is not opposed because Jeremiah spoke on the temporal and physical reign, but Gabriel on the spiritual and eternal kingdom. In this Augustine agrees: “Such a people were going to lose the kingdom but Christ Jesus our Lord is going to reign over it not carnally, but spiritually.” [747](#) Christ was also not a temporal king by the title of election, as is clear from Luke 12: “O

man, who set me up as a judge or as a candidate among you?” In other words, neither an emperor nor a republic has chosen me as a judge. Also from that in John 6: “When he knew that they were going to come to take him and make him a king, he fled again to the mountain alone.” Therefore, it seems he refused to accept his election as king.

Next, he also was not a temporal king by the right of war for his war was not with mortal kings but with the prince of darkness, as is clear from John 12: “Now the prince of this world is cast out.” [748](#) And in Colossians: “Despoiling the principalities and powers he cut them down boldly, triumphant in himself over them.” [749](#) And in 1 John 3: “In this the Son of God appeared that he would break the works of the devil.” Therefore by right of war Christ acquired a spiritual kingdom to rule over our hearts through faith and grace, where beforehand the devil ruled through vice and sin.

Next, the fact that he was not a temporal king by a special gift of God is clear from John 18: “My kingdom is not of this world.” and: “My kingdom is not of this place.” The Fathers, such as Chrysostom, Theophylactus, Cyril, Augustine and Ambrose, all show in this place that Christ meant to free Pilate from suspicion by these words, by which he could believe that he feigned a temporal kingdom of the Jews. For that reason the sense is: I am indeed a king, but not like Caesar and Herod; for my kingdom is not of this world, that is, it does not consist in honors, wealth or worldly power, etc. And this argument is confirmed by the fact that Christ never exercised royal power in this world. He came to minister, not be ministered to, to be judged, not to judge. Therefore, were he to receive royal authority it would be in vain since power is useless if it is never brought to act.

They respond that Christ exercised this power when he cast out those buying sheep and oxen from the temple in John 2. But to cast men out from the temple is not the duty of a king, but the priest. For if the priests threw out the king himself from the temple, as they did with Uzziah and by force, [750](#) how much more easily could he throw out merchants? Besides, it must be known that Christ did not cast those men from the temple as the priests, or with royal power, but after the custom of the Prophets with divine zeal, such as Phineas who killed the fornicators, and Elijah the prophets of Baal. And for that reason the Jews said to the Lord: “What sign do you

show us, that you do these things?” In other words, how will we know you are a Prophet and sent from God with such power?

Secondly, it is confirmed for the same reason. For royal authority was not necessary for Christ, nor useful, but plainly redundant and useless because the purpose of his coming into the world was the redemption of the human race, but to this end temporal power was not necessary, rather spiritual power. Accordingly, he could even dispose of temporal affairs by that spiritual power in the way he judged it expedient for the redemption of the human race. The fact, however, that such merely temporal power was useless for Christ can be understood for the very reason that Christ ought to persuade men to have contempt for glory, delights, wealth and all earthly things, which kings of this world most especially abound in: “Those who are clothed in soft raiment, they are in the houses of kings.” [751](#)

Lastly, it is confirmed for the reason that nearly all passages of Scripture which treat on the kingdom of Christ ought necessarily be understood concerning a spiritual and eternal kingdom; hence, it cannot be deduced from Scripture that Christ was ever a temporal king. Psalm 2 treats on the kingdom of Christ, where it says: “I have been constituted a king by him,” and in the same place it is added: “Preaching his command;” that a spiritual kingdom is shown. Likewise in Daniel 2:44, “In the days of those kingdoms God will raise the kingdom of heaven, which will never be destroyed,” and in Luke 1:33, “And of his kingdom there will be no end.”

But temporal kingdoms are not eternal, and if Christ was king of the Jews, by human custom, while he lived on earth, certainly he would cease to reign in that way when he ascended to the Father. Therefore, how will there be no end to his kingdom? And when the same kingdom was seized a little after by the Romans, then the Saracens, and now is held by the Turks, which, since that has happened, how does it fulfill what Daniel said, that his kingdom will not be given to another? Therefore, Christ was not the temporal king of Judah, but the spiritual king of the Church, of whose kingdom the temporal reign of David and Solomon were but a figure. It is for this reason that the Father gave to Christ the seat of David his father, that he would reign in the house of Jacob forever.

But now the assumption of the first argument must be explained. We said the Pope has that office which Christ had when he lived among men in human custom on earth. For we cannot attribute to the Pope the duties

which Christ has as God, or as immortal and glorified man, but only those which he had as a mortal man. Because the Church consists of men, it needs a visible head, by the custom of living men. Therefore, Christ, when he ceased to live in human fashion (that is, after the resurrection), left Peter behind in his place to show us that the reign of Christ is visible and human which the Church had before the passion of Christ, as is clear from those words of John 20: "As the Father sent me, I also send you."

Add that the Pope does not have all the power which Christ had when he was a mortal man. For he, because he was God and man, had a certain power which they call an excellence, through which he was over both the faithful and the infidels; but he consigned only his sheep to the Pope, that is, the faithful. Besides, Christ could establish the Sacraments and do miracles by his own authority, which the Pope cannot do. Likewise he could absolve from sin without the Sacraments, something the Pope cannot. Therefore, he only communicated that power to the Pope which he could share with a pure man, and which was necessary to govern the faithful so that they might be able to obtain eternal life without hindrance. The fact follows that Christ, as a mortal man, did not have any temporal kingdom, nor does the Pope, as vicar of Christ, have such a kingdom.

CHAPTER V: The Arguments to the Contrary are Answered.

YET some oppose this and object: 1) From the words of the Lord in Matthew, “All power in heaven and earth has been given to me.” [752](#) From there it seems to be understood that Christ had spiritual and earthly dominion. Moreover, he gave the keys of both kingdoms to Peter, as Pope Nicholas I says in his epistle to the emperor Michael: “Christ consigned to Blessed Peter the key-bearer of eternal life together with earthly life and the laws of the heavenly kingdom.”

I respond: The Lord did not mean temporal power such as of earthly kings, but only spiritual, as St. Jerome and Anselm say, who understood the sense of the words: “All power in heaven and earth has been given to me,” in other words, just as in heaven I am the king of angels, so through faith the ruler over the hearts of men, or (as Theophylactus adds) it is a certain supreme power over all creatures, not temporal but divine, or like to the divine, which cannot be communicated to mortal man.

Now, to the testimony of Nicholas I say in the first place that is cited by Gratian, [753](#) but is not discovered among the epistles of Pope Nicholas. Secondly, I add that if it really was the opinion of Pope Nicholas, it has this sense, that Christ consigned to Peter the right of earthly empire at the same time with the heavenly; that is, Christ conceded to Peter that which he would loose or bind on earth, should be loosed or bound in heaven. For Nicholas alluded to the words of the Lord in Matthew 16.

Nor could we explain it otherwise, even if we would have it that Nicholas opposed himself when he taught so eloquently in the same epistle that Christ distinguished acts, duties and dignities of Pope and emperor, lest either the Emperor would presume to usurp the rights of the Pope or vice versa.

2) They object secondly with the Scripture, in which the Lord conceded two swords to Peter. [754](#) For when the disciples say, “Behold there are two swords here,” the Lord does not say it is too much, but it is enough; for

this reason St. Bernard [755](#) and Pope Boniface VIII [756](#) deduce from this passage that the Pope has two swords from the establishment of Christ.

I respond: In the literal sense, no mention is made in that passage of the Gospel of the spiritual or temporal sword of the Pope; rather the Lord merely wished to advise the disciples with those words that they were going to go through crises and fear in the time of his passion, in which men usually sell their tunic to buy a sword as is gathered from Theophylactus and other fathers. Hence, St. Bernard and Pope Boniface mystically interpreted this passage, but they did not mean to say that the Pope has both swords in the same manner, but in one way and another, as we shall explain a little later.

3) All quarrels and contentions, both spiritual and temporal, pertain to the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff. For that is held expressly in the canon *Quicunque litem* and the canon: *Quaecunque contentions*, 11. quest. 1.

I respond: From those two canons the first is of the Emperor Theodosius, who conferred that out of piety, but not from an honor due to the Church. Besides, in that canon he did not give the right to judge civil cases to the Pope alone, but to all bishops if these should be brought to them. Next, these canons were already abrogated by other canons, as the Glossa asserts in the same place. It is evident that the second canon says that it is not for a prince to fashion laws but for a particular bishop; yet it is of uncertain authority, which is why it is marked by the term *Palaea*. Besides it can be understood in a correct manner, that is, concerning all contentions which cannot be settled by the secular judges, whether because the judge does not want to administer justice, or the other party does not wish to obey, for then the cases fall upon the judgment of the Church through the way of fraternal correction, as Innocent III rightly teaches. [757](#)

4) The fourth argument is that when the ruler is away, the Supreme Pontiff succeeds in administration, and uses imperial power until another emperor has been elected, as was held by Innocent III, [758](#) and the Council of Vienne. [759](#) For that reason, it is a sign that imperial power flows from the Supreme Pontiff just as from a supreme temporal prince.

I respond: The Pope succeeded the emperor when the throne was vacant, but not in all matters, rather only in the authority to judge and settle those cases which the emperor usually judged, and those matters which do not

easily suffer delay. But the reason for this is not that the Pope is a supreme temporal prince, but that all cases cannot be settled by temporal judges come down to the spiritual judge, as we will say below and have said for our part.

CHAPTER VI: The Pope Indirectly Holds Temporal Power.

THE TEACHING of the theologians must be expressed and then also proved. Thus we assert: 1) the Pope as Pope, even if he does not have any merely temporal power, still has the supreme power to manage the temporal affairs of all Christians for the sake of the spiritual good. Many explain this by means of a similitude to the art of bridle making and the equestrian art and similar things. For as these two arts are different among themselves, because they have more distinct objects and subjects and actions, nevertheless, because the end of one is ordered to the end of the other therefore, one is in charge of the other and prescribes laws for it; so the ecclesiastical and political powers seem to be distinct, and still are subordinated to one end, because the end of one is referred to the other.

But this similitude is not altogether agreeable. For in those arts the inferior exists only on account of the superior, to the extent that if you take away the superior you immediately get rid of the inferior. For if there was no equestrian art, certainly the makers of bridles would be redundant. But political power does not exist only on account of the ecclesiastical, for even if the ecclesiastical did not exist, still the political would exist, as is clear among the infidels, where true temporal and political power exists and still without being ordered towards some true ecclesiastical and spiritual power.

Therefore, another similitude is by far more suitable for us, which St. Gregory Nazianzen gives in an oration to a people demoralized by fear and an angry emperor. For as the flesh and the spirit exist in a man, so the two powers exist in the Church. Flesh and the spirit are like two republics, which can be found separated and joined. The flesh has the sense and the appetite in which acts and proportionate objects correspond, and the immediate end of all these is health and the good constitution of the body. The spirit has the intellect, will, acts and their proportionate objects for the purpose of health and perfection of the soul. The flesh is discovered without the spirit among the brute animals, and the spirit is discovered without the flesh among the angels.

From such it appears that neither exists precisely on account of the other, for flesh is found joined to the spirit in man where, because they make one person, necessarily they hold a subordination and connection. For the flesh is subject while the spirit is preeminent, although the spirit does not mix itself in the actions of the flesh, but corrects it to exercise all its actions, as it exercises in brute animals. Yet, when these impede the end of the spirit itself, the spirit commands the flesh, and castigates it if it must, commands fastings, and other afflictions, even with some detriment and weakness to the flesh itself. It also compels the tongue not to speak, the eyes not to see, etc. For equal reason, if to obtain the end of the spirit some operation of the flesh would be necessary—and even death itself—the spirit can command the flesh that it should expose itself, as we see in the martyrs.

So political power has altogether its princes, laws, judgments etc., and likewise the Church has its bishops, canons and judgments. The former has for its end temporal peace, the latter, eternal salvation. Sometimes they are found separated, as formerly in the time of the Apostles, and sometimes they are found joined, as even now; but when they are joined, they make one body, and therefore ought to be connected, the lower subjected to the higher, and subordinated.

Therefore, the spiritual does not mix itself in temporal business, but permits all things to proceed as before they were joined, provided it does not hinder the spiritual end, or those things necessary to obtain it. But if it should be necessary, the spiritual power ought also to coerce the temporal in every way in which it appears necessary.

Now, let us explain all these matters in more detail. The spiritual power of the Pope must be compared with the persons of judges, or of secular princes, with their civil laws and with their forum and judgments.

Inasmuch as it concerns persons, the Pope, as Pope, cannot ordinarily depose temporal princes, even for a just cause, in the way in which he deposes bishops, i.e., just as an ordinary judge; yet he can take a kingdom away from one and bestow it on another as the supreme spiritual prince if it would be necessary for the salvation of souls, as we will prove.

Insofar as it concerns laws, the Pope cannot ordinarily, as Pope, make civil law, or strengthen or weaken the laws of princes, because he is not the political prince of the Church. Still, he can do all those things if some civil law would be necessary to the salvation of souls and still, kings would not

wish to make such a law, or if another would be injurious to the salvation of souls but still kings do not wish to abrogate it.

Therefore the best law is that which the Glossa hands down which is:

[760](#) When imperial laws are discovered contrary to papal ones on the same matter, and the matter of the law concerns danger to souls, the imperial law is abrogated by the pontifical law. And in this way pontifical law, which is contained in the chapter *Finali*, on the prescriptions, abrogated an imperial law which is contained in the Codex on prescriptions that were thirty or fifty years old; it was also made with bad faith, because it could not be preserved without mortal sin. But when the matter of the law is a temporal affair that does not concern the salvation of souls, pontifical law does not abrogate the imperial, but each is preserved, the former in the ecclesiastical forum, the latter in the civil forum.

Insofar as judgments are concerned, the Pope cannot as Pope, ordinarily judge on temporal affairs. St. Bernard rightly says to Pope Eugene: “These low and earthly matters have their own judges, kings and princes of the earth. Why do you invade foreign boundaries? Why does your sickle stretch out to a foreign harvest? ... your power is in crimes, not in possessions.”

[761](#) But, just the same, in those cases which are necessary to the salvation of souls, the Pope can also assume temporal judgments, when, without a doubt, there is nobody who could judge, e.g., when two supreme kings contend, or when those who can and ought to judge will not pass judgment. For that reason, the same Bernard said: “It is one thing to sally into those matters per chance as an incident requires, but another to press on in such affairs, as if the nature of such things merited such a focus..” And Innocent III, says that the Pope exercises temporal jurisdiction only accidentally.

[762](#)

CHAPTER VII: The Teaching of the Theologians Is Proven by Reason.

HEREFORE, this teaching can be proven in two ways, by reasoning and examples.

Ta) The civil power has been subjected to the spiritual power when each part is of the same Christian republic. Therefore the spiritual prince can command temporal princes and dispose of temporal affairs for the sake of a spiritual good. For every superior can command an inferior.

Moreover, that political power, not only as it is Christian, but even as it is political, would be subjected to the ecclesiastical power. This is so for three reasons: a) It is proven from the end of each. For the temporal end is subordinated to the spiritual end, as is clear because temporal happiness is not absolutely the final end, and therefore, ought to be referred to eternal happiness; besides it is certain from Aristotle that as the faculties are subordinated, so are the ends. [763](#)

b) Kings and Popes, clergy and laity, do not make two republics, rather one. This is one Church, for we are all one body [764](#) but in every body the members are connected and there is a dependency of one upon the other. Moreover, it is not rightly asserted that spiritual matters depend upon temporal ones; rather temporal matters depend upon and are subjected to the spiritual.

c) If the temporal administration impedes a spiritual good, the judgment of all is that the temporal prince must change that mode of governance, even to the detriment of the temporal good; therefore it is a sign that the temporal power is subject to the spiritual.

Nor would the response of some satisfy, namely that the prince is held to change the plan of his governance, not on account of subjection or subordination to the spiritual power, but only due to the order of charity, in which we are held to put the greater goods ahead of lesser ones.

This is because one state is not held to suffer detriment for the sake of charity, lest another more noble state suffer a detriment. And one private man who is held to give all his goods for the conversion of his state is not still held to do likewise on account of a foreign state, although it would be nobler. Therefore, when a temporal state is held to suffer detriment on account of the spiritual power, it is a sign that these two are not different, but parts of one and the same, and one is subject to the other.

Nor would it avail if one were to say that a temporal prince is not held to suffer detriment for the spiritual good; not because of the subjection to the spiritual state, but because otherwise he would harm his own subjects for whom it is evil to lose spiritual things for the sake of temporal ones. This is because even if they are not subjects, but men of another kingdom who suffer notable injury in spiritual matters on account of the temporal administration of some Christian king, that king is held to change his mode of governance; for which matter no other reason can be given but that they are members of the same body, and one subject to another.

2) The ecclesiastical state ought to be perfect, and sufficient to itself for the sake of its end, just as are all well established states; therefore, it ought to have all the power necessary to attain its end. But the power of using and disposing in regard to temporal affairs is necessary to a spiritual end, otherwise wicked princes could foster heretics with impunity as well as overturn religion. Therefore, the ecclesiastical state has this power.

Likewise, each state can (because it ought to be perfect and sufficient unto itself) command another state that is not subject to it, and compel it to change its administration, nay more, even depose its prince and institute another, when it cannot otherwise defend itself from his injuries. Therefore the spiritual state can command much more than the temporal state subject to it, and compel it to change administration as well as depose its princes, and also to institute others when it cannot safeguard its spiritual good. And in this way the words of St. Bernard [765](#) and Pope Boniface VIII [766](#) must be understood, where they say that both swords are in the power of the Pope. For they mean the Pope has in himself properly the spiritual sword, and because the temporal sword is subject to the spiritual, the Pope can command a king, or interdict the use of the temporal sword when the necessity of the Church requires it.

These are the words of St. Bernard, which Pope Boniface imitated: “Why do you (he says addressing the Pope) again try to usurp the sword, which you once bid to be sheathed? Still, anyone who would deny this it seems does not sufficiently attend the word of the Lord, saying ‘put your sword back in its sheath.’ Therefore, yours must be sheathed at least by your nod, if not by our hand; otherwise in no way does it pertain to you and that, while the Apostles were saying: ‘Behold here there are two swords,’ the Lord would not have responded: ‘It is enough,’ but “it is too much”. Therefore, the Church has each sword, the spiritual and the material, but it is on behalf of the Church. Moreover, the Church must exercise it. The one at the hand of the priest, the other at the hand of the soldier, but rightly at the nod of the priest, and the command of the emperor.” There it should also be noted that when the heretics condemn Pope Boniface’s teaching as erroneous, arrogant, tyrannical (for thus they say in all their works about him), they ought to be warned that they should think the same about the words of St. Bernard in the books of *de Consideratione*, where he so spoke without flattery that Calvin said that truth itself seems to speak. [767](#)

3) Christians may not tolerate an infidel or heretical king if he would try to drag his subjects to his heresy or infidelity. Yet, to judge whether the king forces to heresy or not pertains to the Pope, to whom the care of religion was consigned. Therefore, it is for the Pope to judge whether a king ought to be deposed or not.

The proposition of this argument is proved from chapter 17 of Deuteronomy, where the people are forbidden to choose a king who would not be from their brethren, that is, not a Jew, lest he would compel the Jews to idolatry; [768](#) consequently, Christians are prohibited to choose a king that is not Christian.

That is a moral precept and it rests upon natural justice. Again, to choose a non-Christian or not depose a non-Christian pertains to the same danger and injury that we have noted; thus, Christians are held not to suffer a non-Christian king over them if he would try to turn the people away from the faith. I add this condition, on account of infidel princes who had their rule over the people before the people converted to the faith. For if such princes do not try to turn the faithful away from the faith, then I do not believe they can be deprived of their dominion, although St. Thomas thought the

contrary. [769](#) But if these same princes would try to turn the people from the faith, all agree they can and ought to be deprived of their dominion.

But if Christians in ancient times did not depose Nero, Diocleatian, Julian the Apostate and Valens the Arian, as well as many like them, that was because Christians lacked temporal strength. That they could lawfully do it just the same is clear from the Apostle when he bids new judges constituted by Christians for the sake of their temporal affairs, lest Christians be compelled to make their case in the presence of the judge who might be a persecutor of Christ. [770](#) As new judges could be constituted, so even new princes and kings for the same reason, if they were to possess sufficient strength to do so.

Besides, to tolerate a heretical or infidel king trying to drag men to his own sect is to expose religion to the clearest danger, as we read in Ecclesiasticus, “For those who live in the city will be like unto its ruler,” [771](#) and from that: “The whole world is conformed to the example of the king.” And experience teaches the same thing; when King Jeroboam was idolatrous a great part of the kingdom began to worship idols. [772](#) After the coming of Christ, during the reign of Constantine, Arianism flourished; during the reign of Julian, Paganism again flourished; even in our times in England, during the reign of Henry VIII and afterward Edward VI, the whole kingdom apostatized from the faith in a certain measure. Under Mary, again the whole kingdom returned to the Church, while under the reign of Elizabeth Calvinism again began to rule and banished the true religion.

But Christians are not held, nay more, ought not tolerate an infidel king when there is evident danger to religion. For when divine and human law are opposed, divine law should be preserved and human law omitted. Moreover, to keep divine law is to keep true faith and religion, which is one, not many, but concerning human law it is merely that of this or that king.

Next, why can a faithful people not be free from the yoke of an infidel king, and free from being dragged to infidelity, if a wife who is Christian is free from the obligation of remaining with an unbelieving husband without injury to faith (outside of those issues involved in divorce), provided that he does not wish to remain with a Christian wife, as is clearly deduced from

Paul? [773](#) For it is no less a power of a spouse over spouse, than of a king over his subjects, albeit in a greater degree.

4) When kings and princes come to the Church to become Christian, they are received with the explicit or tacit agreement that they will subject their scepters to Christ and promise that they are going to preserve and defend the faith of Christ, even under the penalty of the loss of their kingdom. Therefore, when they become heretics or harm religion, they can be judged by the Church and even deposed from their rule; nor is any injury done them if they are deposed. One who is not prepared to serve Christ and to lose whatever he has on account of him is not suited to the Sacrament of Baptism, for the Lord says, "If anyone comes to me, and does not hate father and mother, wife and sons, even his life, he cannot be my disciple."

[774](#) Besides, the Church would grievously err if she were to admit some king who willed to foster some sect with impunity, as well as defend heretics and overturn religion.

5) When it was said to Peter: "Feed my sheep," [775](#) all faculty was given to him which is necessary for a shepherd to guard the flock which is threefold:

a) Concerning wolves, to ward them off by any means they can; b) concerning rams, that if ever they harm the flock with their horns, he can enclose and forbid them lest they go any further ahead of the flock; c) concerning the remaining sheep, that he should give agreeable food to each one, therefore the supreme Pontiff has this threefold power.

From here, three arguments are deduced from this passage. Firstly, wolves who devastate the Church of the Lord are heretics, as is clear from Matthew, "Beware of false prophets, etc." [776](#) Therefore, if some from the sheep or rams would become a heretic, that is, go from being Christians to heretics, the shepherd of the Church can ward them off with excommunication and at the same time bid the people not to follow them, and hence deprive a man of dominion over his subjects.

Secondly, the pastor can separate and enclose furious destructive rams from the flock, and a prince is a furious destructive ram in the sheepfold when he is of the Catholic faith but is exceedingly wicked and does great harm to religion and the Church, such as if he were to sell episcopacies,

destroy churches, etc. Consequently, the shepherd of the Church can enclose him, or return him to the rank of the sheep.

The third argument is that the pastor can and ought to so feed all his sheep as is fitting for them. Therefore, the Pope can and ought to command these things from Christians and compel them to each of those things to which they are held according to their state in life. That is, to compel individuals that they should serve God in the way in which they ought to according to their state. Moreover, kings ought to serve God by defending the Church and punishing heretics as well as schismatics, as St. Augustine, St. Leo and St. Gregory teach. [777](#) Therefore, he can and ought to command kings that they should do this, and unless they will have done it, he will compel them through excommunication and other fitting measures.

[778](#)

CHAPTER VIII: The Same thing is Proved by Examples.

NOW we come to examples. 1) We read in 2 Chronicles 26 that King Uzziah, when he had usurped the office of the priests, was cast out of the temple by the high priest, and when on account of the same sin he was struck with leprosy by God, he was also compelled to leave the city and resign the kingdom to his son. Moreover, he was not deprived of the city and administration of the kingdom by his own will, but by the judgment of the priest. For we read in Leviticus, "Whoever has been stained with leprosy, being set apart at the judgment of the priest, he will live alone outside the camp." [779](#) Therefore, when this law was in Israel, and at the same time we read 2 Chronicles 26, that the king dwelt alone outside the city in a solitary house, and his son judged the people of the land in the city, we are compelled to say that he was separated at the judgment of the priest, and consequently, deprived from the authority of rule. So, if because of corporal leprosy the priest could once judge and deprive a king of rule, why could he not do that in the case of spiritual leprosy, or in other words because of heresy, which is prefigured through leprosy as St. Augustine teaches; [780](#) especially when Paul says that everything happened to the Jews in figure? [781](#)

2) In 2 Chronicles 23 we read that when Athalia tyrannically occupied the kingdom and fostered the worship of Baal, Jehoiada, the high priest, called sergeants and soldiers, and commanded them to kill Athalia, which they also did and created Joas king in her place. There, the high priest did not persuade, but commanded, and it is clear from the words of 4 Kings, "And they made sergeants according to all things which the priest Jehoiada commanded them." [782](#) And likewise from 2 Chronicles, "Jehoiada the high priest went out to the sergeants and chiefs of the army; he said to them: 'Lead her (Queen Athalia) outside the precincts of the temple,' and she was killed outside with a sword." [783](#) The fact is that the reason for this deposition and killing of Athalia was not only that she was a tyrant, but

because she also fostered the worship of Baal, which is clear from the words which are placed immediately after her death: “Therefore, all the people went into the house of Baal, and destroyed it, and broke both the altars and the idols; they also killed Mathan, the priest of Baal, before the altar.”

3) The example of Blessed Ambrose. When he was bishop of Milan he was also the pastor and spiritual father of the Emperor Theodosius, who ordinarily kept court at Milan. First, he excommunicated the emperor on account of the slaughter which he had commanded his soldiers to make at Thessalonika, then commanded him to impose a law to invalidate the death sentences or the confiscation of goods but for thirty days from the pronouncement of the sentence, so that what had been commanded from anger should be so drawn up that within the space of as many days it could be recalled. [784](#)

Yet, Ambrose could not excommunicate Theodosius for that slaughter, unless he knew and judged the case beforehand; although were it a criminal case it would have pertained to the external forum. Moreover, he could not know and judge a case of this sort unless he was also the legitimate judge of Theodosius in the external forum.

Besides, to compel an emperor to impose a political law and to prescribe for him the form of law, does not this manifestly show that a bishop can use temporal power now and again, even over those who received power over others? If a bishop can do it, how much more the prince of bishops?

4) Gregory I conceded a privilege to the monastery of St. Medard, which is contained at the end of the epistles: “If anyone, be they kings, bishops, judges or any other secular person, should violate the decrees of this apostolic authority and of our precept, no matter how great his dignity and highness might be, he shall be deprived from that honor.”

5) Gregory II excommunicated the emperor Leo the Iconoclast and forbade taxes to be paid to him from Italy, and hence he punished him with a fine in part of his empire. Even the Centuriators affirm this, [785](#) but they condemn Gregory and call him a traitor to his own country. But they advance no writer who censures the deed of Gregory, while on the other hand we have many writers who praised this deed as holy and legitimate, such as Cedrenus, Zonaras [786](#) and all other historians who wrote on the deeds of these times.

6) Pope Zachary, who was asked by the nobles of France to depose Childeric and create Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, as king in his place. The reason was that due to the inaction of Childeric, it seemed that religion and the very kingdom in France were on the verge of ruin, as is clear from Cedrenus in the life of Leo the Isaurian, Paul the Deacon, [787](#) and St. Boniface in his epistle to Pope Zachary.

The heretics also acknowledge this deed and condemn it, such as the Centuriators who say that Pope Zachary violently assumed quasi-divine authority to himself. [788](#) Still, there is no ancient author that can be found who condemned this deed, moreover we have a great many more approved authors on our side, such as Ado, Sigebert and Rhegius; [789](#) but on this matter we spoke enough previously against Calvin. [790](#)

7) Leo III translated the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, for the reason that the Greeks could advance no help to the labor of the western church. From this it came to pass, that although imperial dignity must not be considered to absolutely come from the Pope, but from God by means of the law of nations (as we showed above from Gelasius, Nicholas and Innocent III), nevertheless emperors at the time of Charlemagne owed their rule to the Pope.

The fact that this power is now with the Germans is due to the Pope, and although it is not absolutely necessary that the Pope would confirm the emperor, or that the emperor furnish an oath of fidelity to the Pope, still from the time of the translation of the empire to the Germans, each is required, as is clear from Innocent III, [791](#) and this is not required unjustly. Whoever could confer the empire upon the Germans for the safety of the Church could also link certain conditions to it, on account of the same cause, lest it would happen that a heretic or schismatic be created emperor.

Our adversaries respond to this example in two ways: a) Some deny the fact that the Pope transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans; the Centuriators are clearly in this number of those that say: "This translation is clearly among the miracles of Antichrist." [792](#) Theodore Bibliander says that Leo III, having usurped authority, transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans. [793](#) b) Others assert that it was

done by law, but the Pope was not the agent, rather it was the Roman people. Marsilius of Padua thinks thus, as Albert Pighius relates. [794](#)

To the first I respond: It is a certain fact that this translation was done lawfully and legitimately. Firstly, from the consent of the whole Christian world, because all Christians held Charlemagne for their true emperor as well as his successors; there was never any Christian king who wished to go before the emperor, even if their power and kingdom were more ancient. The Lutherans were the first to despoil the people from faith and religion and also plotted to topple the emperor from his seat. [795](#)

Secondly, we consider the happy event of this translation. God adorned Charles with many victories to show this fact; he made this kingdom the most flourishing and useful to the Church. Thirdly, from the confession of the Emperor of the Greeks, who at one time did not concede that the Roman Pontiff could do this, but later did. For in the first place when the Empress Irene heard that Charles had been called emperor by Leo, not only did she not protest, but even wished to marry Charlemagne, and she would have but for the impudence of a treacherous eunuch, as Zonaras writes as well as Cedrenus in the life of the same Irene.

Next, after Irene died, Emperor Nicephorus, who succeeded her, sent legates to Charlemagne, as though he were emperor, as Ado writes in his chronicle for the year 803; and a little after the death of Nicephorus, Michael succeeded him, and likewise sent legates to Charlemagne, who clearly greeted him as emperor, which Ado writes in his Chronicle for the year 810. Not only the Greeks, but even the Persian legates sent gifts to the emperor, as Rhegius [796](#) and Otho of Frisia write. [797](#) Again, Immanuel, the Emperor of the Greeks, when he heard that Pope Alexander III was reduced to extreme necessity by Emperor Frederick, offered help to the same Pope, as well as give a vast sum of money if he would return the Empire of the West to the emperors of Constantinople. But the Pope responded that he would not unite what his ancestors had divided even for the best and most advantageous reasons. There, it must be noted that Immanuel did not want any more from the Pope than the title of Emperor. He knew well enough that the Pope could not give actual possession; rather it would have to be acquired by force of arms. But he would not have wanted to buy the title for such a price if it were empty, or even false, or if he believed it was illegitimate.

To the others, who say the author of the translation was not the Pope, but the Roman people, it is easy to respond. In the first place the Roman people almost never had the power to create the emperor. The ancient emperors either had rule by hereditary right, such as Octavian, Tiberius, Gaius [Caligula], or were created by the army as was Claudius, Vespasian and others. It was the ordinary custom, that the Emperor be created by the army, as St. Jerome witnesses in his epistle to Evagrius.

For that reason, we read an extant canon [798](#) from the time of Charlemagne, that there was no army of the Romans who could create him emperor. In Italy there were only the armies of the Greeks and the Lombards and all these were hostile to Charlemagne. It is also certain that he did not have any hereditary right to rule.

Next, if the Roman people ever had any authority in the election of an Emperor, they lost it when the seat of the empire was transferred to Constantinople. Thereafter, for nearly five-hundred years from Constantine the Great even to Charlemagne, the Senate and the Roman people never did anything in regard to the creation of an emperor.

Besides, all authors who write on this matter, such as Zonaras and Cedrenus, [799](#) Paul the Deacon, [800](#) Ado, [801](#) Albert Krantz, [802](#) Odo of Frisia, [803](#) Marianus Scotus, Hermannus Contractus, Lambertus, Sigebert, Rhegius, Palmerius, Blondus, and all others, *Chronicles* or *Histories* of Leo III assert that he transferred the Empire from the Greeks to the Franks (Germans). Innocent III teaches the same thing when he says: “The right and power of this sort comes to them from the Apostolic See, which transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans in the person of the magnificent Charles.” [804](#) And he adds that the princes of Germany certainly recognize it. Charlemagne himself did not treat this ambiguously when he wrote his testament, wherein he leaves behind his sons as heirs of the empire. He sent it to Pope Leo that it would be confirmed by him, as Ado writes in his *Chronicle* for the year 804. Next, the same is clear from the confession of the Greek emperor Emmanuel, as was noted above.

8) Gregory V published a law on the election of the emperor by seven German princes, which is preserved even to our day. That this is so, many historians assert; [805](#) even the Centuriators acknowledge this in these words: “Gregory was going to adorn his country with some notable dignity,

so he ratified that the law of choosing a king was in the power of the Germans alone, so that after the emperor had received the crown from the Roman Pontiff, he would be called Augustus. Electors were constituted as at Moguntianum, Trier, the archbishop of Cologne, the Marquise of Brandenburg, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony and the king of Bohemia.” [806](#) Whether the Pope had done this lawfully, they do not disclose. But if they were to say it was done lawfully, then they would be compelled to affirm that the Pope is superior to emperor and princes, as is clear; but if they would say it was not lawful but done tyrannically, they would injure their patrons and protectors, such as the Duke of Saxony, the Count of the Palatine and the Marquis of Brandenburg. For what do they have that is greater than an electorate? But it would not have been done rightly if he who gave it could not give it. Moreover, that the Pope gave it is beyond controversy.

Here we must note that Onuphrius writes against the common opinion of the historians, [807](#) in that this decree on the election of the emperor was not of Gregory V but Gregory X. I rather think that even if the matter was so, concerning which we now treat, it would cause no harm. Still it is not true, for Innocent III, who sat 70 years before Gregory X, indicates that it had already been conceded by the Apostolic See a long time before for specific German princes to have the right to elect the emperor. [808](#) Heinrich Hostius, who lived before the times of Gregory X, says in his commentary on the chapter of Innocent we just mentioned, that Innocent speaks of the seven electors. Pelagius Alvarus, who lived a little after the times of Gregory X, also mentions everything Gregory X did but affirms that the election of the Emperor which is now in use was established by Gregory V, and he enumerates the seven electors in the same place which we had named above. [809](#)

9) Gregory VII deposed Emperor Henry IV and bid another to be chosen, and even the Centuriators affirm this event. [810](#) That this deed was done with the approval and applause of all good men we have already shown in the previous book, where we defended the Popes from so many calumnies of the heretics. [811](#)

10) Innocent III deposed Otho IV in a similar fashion, as is clear from Blondus. [812](#)

11) Innocent IV, at the general council of Lyons (with the consent of all the Fathers), deposed Frederick II and declared the empire vacant for 28 years, as Matthew Palmerius records in his *Chronicle*. The whole sentence imposed on Frederick is extant. [813](#) Innocent IV was also a coadjutor to a certain king of Portugal to administer the kingdom, seeing that the negligence of the king was to the detriment of the state and religion in Portugal. [814](#)

12) Clement VI deposed Emperor Louis IV who had been excommunicated by John XXII and Benedict XII. You can see his history in the works of Albert Pighius, [815](#) and Robert Arboricensis. [816](#)

The arguments of our adversaries were partly answered in book 2 of this work, and can partly be answered from the foregoing with scarcely any labor. See Juan de Torquemada, [817](#) and Albert Pighius; [818](#) there they answer certain arguments, but they are light and easy.

CHAPTER IX: It Is Not Opposed with the Word of God That One Man Would Be an Ecclesiastical Prince and a Political One at the Same Time

SO WE proceed unto the third part of the question, since our adversaries teach two specific things on the temporal rule which the Supreme Pontiff has. [819](#) 1) That he occupies the possession by mere theft; 2) even if he did have a just title, he cannot lawfully retain it because it is opposed with spiritual rule, as Calvin so argues. [820](#) It behooves us to show both, so as to prove that it can be fitting for the Pope to have and possess a sovereignty of this sort, both really and justly, which he has and does possess.

Therefore, that it is not opposed for the Pope to be at the same time a spiritual prince and the prince of some province, is proven first from the examples of the saints who were found to be both kings and priests. For in the law of nature Melchisedech was a king and a priest, as is clear from Genesis 14 and Hebrews 7 and more to the point, once the first born son was both king and priest, as St. Jerome teaches. [821](#)

It is also certain that Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were both in charge of those matters that pertained to religion as well as those which pertained to political life.

Next, that Moses was both a temporal high prince and the High Priest is clear from Scripture. For in Exodus 18 it is said: "Moses sat to judge the people." And in chapter 32 he commanded a great number of the people to be slain for idolatry. In chapter 40 he burnt incense to the Lord, which was the proper office of the priest in particular. [822](#) Likewise in Leviticus 8, Moses consecrated Aaron into the priesthood, sanctified the tabernacle and altar, offered sacrifices and holocausts, something that only the priest can do. Therefore, Philo of Alexandria says at the end of his *Life of Moses*:

“This is the life, this is the death of Moses the king, lawgiver, priest and prophet.” [823](#) Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration to Gregory of Nyssa, says: “Moses, the prince of princes, and priest of priests, used Aaron for a tongue.” Next, Augustine said about the reign of Moses: “He sat alone in judicial loftiness, while all the people stood about.” [824](#) On his priesthood, he says, “Together they were high priests, Moses and Aaron.” [825](#)

Additionally, Heli was both priest and a judge in state for forty years, as is clear from 1 Kings (1 Samuel) I and IV. Then the Maccabees, Judas, Jonathan, Simon, John and the rest, even to Herod who was at the same time high priest and head of state, as is clear from the book of Maccabees, and from Josephus. [826](#)

Secondly, it is proved by reason. a) ecclesiastical power and political power are not contrary, but both are good, both are from God, both are praiseworthy and one serves the other, so they are not opposed in and of themselves. Therefore, they can be in the same subject.

b) Peace and war are more diverse than temporal and spiritual goods, but one and the same king at the same time is over the senate and the army, civilians and combatants, so one can be much more in charge in both temporal and spiritual matters.

c) One king can govern a very diverse realm, even if it should have very different customs, rites, laws, and traditions, and for equal reason one bishop can rule a great many churches, as is clear from the ancient patriarchs (that I might omit the Roman), each of which had a great number of bishops under him; therefore one man can rule one episcopate, and one realm. Thus, it is either more difficult to rule an episcopate than a realm, easier, or equally difficult. If more difficult, then if one man rules two episcopates, he will rule one episcopate and one dominion from the greater of the two; if it is easier, then he rules two dominions so he will rule one dominion and one episcopate from the greater of the dominions; if it is equally difficult then if one man rules two dominions or two episcopates, in a similar fashion he will be able to rule one episcopate and one dominion.

d) Those who donated their temporal rule to the bishop of Rome and other bishops were pious men, and for that reason they were especially commended by the whole Church, as is clear in the example of Constantine,

Charlemagne and Louis his son, who was thereafter called the pious. Even our adversaries praise them, and on the other hand, when some rulers tried to take away a temporal dominion of this sort, such as King Aistulphus of the Lombards, Henry IV and V, Otho IV, Frederick I and II, then all historians regarded them as impious and sacrilegious.

Ado writes thus about Aistulphus in his *Chronicle*: “Aistulphus, the king of the Lombards, was treacherous and gave the resources of the Roman Church to his own soldiers... Aistulphus, as a faithless man, always lied... by divine judgment, while he went on a hunt, right away he was struck and died.” [827](#) Not only the historians, but a saint remarks on this. St. Bernard vehemently rebuked the Roman people because they had departed from obedience to Pope Eugene; the reason for this departure had been, according to Platina and other historians, that the Roman people refused to be under the Pontiff in temporal affairs, but wished to be governed by the ancient custom through republican consuls. On Henry IV, see what we said above. [828](#)

Nor were the best princes only those who so gave an inheritance to the Holy See, but even a great many of those who received wealth and dominion of this sort. Platina writes that Leo IV was glorified by miracles. All writers call Leo IX a saint, and Sigebert as well as Otho of Frisia write that he was glorified with miracles. Lambert Schaffnaburg wrote that Gregory VII was glorious with miracles, and one of the best men. As we have related many things about him above, [829](#) we will omit the rest. Peter from Aliacus, the bishop of Cambrai describes the life of Celestine V as very holy and glorified by miracles. Next, Adrian I, Leo III, Nicholas I, Innocent III and several others are praised by all writers, though it is certain enough that they administered both the earthly dominion together with the pontificate.

e) Lastly, it is shown by experience. Even if it were to be brought to bear that priests only treat spiritual things, and kings temporal, still, on account of the malice of the times experience declares that not only advantageously, but even necessarily, some temporal dominions were given to the Pope and even to other bishops by the singular providence of God. Moreover, if there were no prince bishops in Germany, then to this day none would have remained in their sees, just as in the Old Testament when there were priests without temporal dominion.

Moreover, in the last times of the Old Testament, religion could not survive and be defended except that the priests were also kings, namely in the time of the Maccabees. So also we see it happened in the Church, that it was not necessary to guard its majesty with temporal dominion in the first times, but now it seems necessary.

Indeed, the fact that the Supreme Pontiff lawfully has the temporal dominion he has can easily be proven because he had it from the gift of princes. For thus Ado writes in his *Chronicle* for the year 727: “King Pepin, when he was over Ravenna, handed over the whole of the ten cities to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul.”

Moreover, a decree of Louis I, the son of Charlemagne, is extant with Gratian in this form: “I, Louis, august emperor of the Romans, establish and concede through this accord of our confirmation to Blessed Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and through you his vicar the lord Paschal, the Supreme Pontiff, and his successors in perpetuity, just as it was in the power of your predecessors even to now it is your power, the dowry you hold and you have laid down over the city of Rome with its dukedom, and suburbs, mountain territories, coastal territories, ports or all cities, castles, towns and villas in the parts of Tuscia.” [830](#)

Likewise, Leo, the bishop of Hostia, says: “The same celebrated king (Pepin) made with his sons a concession to Blessed Peter and his vicar the designated boundaries concerning the cities of Italy and its territories. From Luna with the island of Corsica, thence in Suranum in Mount Bardo, Vercetum, Parma, Rhegius, Mantua, and the mountain of Silicis, and at the same time the whole exarchate of Ravenna, just as it was more anciently, with the provinces of the Veneto and Histria, and the whole duchy of Spoleto and Benevento.... At length, the same king together with the Roman Pontiff coming into Italy subjected Ravenna and twenty cities taken from Aistulph to the Apostolic See.” [831](#) The same Leo also writes, “In the year of the incarnation of the Lord, 1079, Count Matilda, fearing the army of the emperor Henry, devoutly offered the provinces of Liguria and Tuscia to Pope Gregory.” [832](#)

The authentic documents of these donations and similar ones are extant at Rome. But even if none of these were extant, then by far the prescription of 800 years would be sufficient in itself. For even if the kingdoms and dominions were acquired by theft, at length they become legitimate after a

long time. Otherwise, by what right would Julius Caesar have occupied the Roman Empire? And still, in the time of Tiberius, Christ said: “Give to Caesar that which is Caesar’s.” [833](#) By what right did the Franks invade France, the Saxons invade Britain, or the Goths Spain, and yet the kingdoms constituted by them in this time are still said to be legitimate?

CHAPTER X: The Contrary Arguments are Answered.

IT REMAINS to answer arguments. The first is of John Calvin, who objects with a verse from Matthew 20: “The kings of the nations lord it over them, but it is not so with you.” There he notes, “The Lord means the office of pastor is not only distinct from the office of a prince, but the matter is too separated to be composed in one man.” [834](#) And because Calvin saw the example of Moses could be offered in refutation he added: “Although Moses held both together, in the first place it came to pass from a rare miracle; second it was temporary, until a better state of affairs could be arranged. Thus a certain form was prescribed by the Lord, thus civil governance was relinquished to him [Moses], while he was bidden to resign the priesthood to his brother, and rightly, for it is beyond nature for one man to sustain the burden of both.”

I respond to both arguments. 1) In this passage the Lord only established mere ecclesiastical princes, and to teach them that, such as they are, they ought to be over their subjects not in the fashion of kings and masters, but in the fashion of fathers and pastors. Thence, it does not follow that one and the same man cannot be both bishop and prince.

Moreover, the example of Moses, which Calvin tries to evade, altogether convicts him. For what he says, that it came to pass by a rare miracle, is shown to be manifestly false by the examples we have already mentioned of Melchisedech, Heli, Judas Maccabaeus and others. What he adds, that it was only done until that time when Aaron was consecrated, has been shown as false by St. Augustine. [835](#) Commenting on Leviticus, he says that in that time Moses and Aaron were priests together, and it is proved from the fact that Moses deposed Aaron as high priest and consecrated Eleazar, the son of Aaron, in his place in Numbers 20. And besides, if after Aaron was ordained dominion and priesthood could no longer be combined in any one person, then how was Heli both a priest and ruler for 40 years? How were the Maccabees such for more than a hundred years?

Secondly, I say, with those words the Lord did not prohibit rule to bishops of the kind that is exercised by pious kings and princes, but the kind

that is exercised by kings ignorant of God, who are more tyrants than kings. That much is clear from the propriety of the Greek words. For Matthew does not say: *kurieuosin autōn*, that is, that they rule simply, but *katakurieuosin*, that is to dominate violently. Just as in 1 Peter 5: “Not lording it over the clergy,” which is: *mēd’ ōs katakurieuontes tōn klēron*. In Joshua 15 we read, “Caleb said: ‘Whoever will have struck Cariath-Sepher, and take it, etc.,’” but in Greek it is *kai katakurieusei autēs*, that is, where this had been dominated, etc. Wherefore, 2 Peter 2 as well as in the Epistle of Jude 1:8, we see the heretics are condemned because they scorn *kuriotēta* (dominion).

Secondly, Calvin objects [836](#) from a verse in Luke where it says, “O man, who constituted me as a judge or as a distributor among you?” [837](#) This shows that the Lord rejected the office of judgment as though it were not fitting for the duty of a preacher and minister of the word, just as the Apostles: “It is not right for us to leave behind the Word of God and to wait on tables.” One who is a prince, however, cannot reject these duties.

A response can be made to the words of the Lord. While the Lord received the person of the priest in this world, and not of a temporal prince, still by these words he warned simple priests not to mix in foreign business. But it can be said better, that generally in each place the Popes and princes are admonished lest they so busy themselves in trifling and vile duties that they are compelled to omit greater things. In this manner Jethro, when he saw Moses sat for the whole day to judge, [838](#) wisely admonished him not to lay aside political rule and only serve the Church, but so that he would constitute the lesser judges to satisfy the people in lighter matters, as well as that they would refer serious matters both political and ecclesiastical to him. Thus St. Bernard also exhorts the Pope with the same words of the Lord, [839](#) and by that medium he exhorts the Pope to delegate judgments on temporal matters to others, though he knew the Pope was a temporal prince.

Thereupon, though the Apostles omitted the care of waiting on tables in Jerusalem in this way, they still presided over temporal matters for the whole Church. For that reason, in Galatians 2:10, Peter, James and John are anxious for their brothers who were in Jerusalem, and they ask Paul and Barnabas that they would be mindful to gather some alms to send to

Jerusalem. But they did that and brought money that they had collected themselves, not to deacons who were put in charge of tables, but to the elders, as it is contained in Acts 11:30.

Thirdly, Calvin objects using the words of St. Bernard: “Rule was forbidden to the Apostles; go, therefore, and dare to usurp or dominate the apostolate, or apostolic dominion. The apostolic model is this, rule is forbidden, ministry is proclaimed.” [840](#)

I respond: Bernard speaks about the Pope as Pope of the whole Church and according to that which he has from the institution of Christ. For a little earlier he said: “Be so that you defend yourself in any other cause, but not by apostolic right, for what he did not have and could not have has not been given to you, etc.” Consequently, Bernard meant that as pastor of all, he ought not exercise dominion over them, but to feed the flock; but just the same, just as a political prince rules the same sheep, insofar as they are citizens of his state, so also the Pope can exercise dominion over them for the same reason, if he were their political prince.

Fourthly, Calvin objects [841](#) with the words of St. Gregory, who says anathema to a bishop who commanded to be given the title to some field by a fiscal custom. [842](#) I respond: Little wonder if Gregory refused bishops and even those in charge of the patrimony of the Roman Church to use fiscal custom to recover fields for the Church. For the Church did not yet have a political prince, but possessed temporal goods by its custom in the way that private citizens possess such. Therefore, it was just that fields which the Church sensed were its own, if by chance they were to be seized by others, should be returned by a legitimate judgment, but not sold to her on her own authority by some fiscal custom.

Fifthly, others object with 2 Tim. 2:4, “No man in God’s service should get mixed up in secular business.” Such words are said to a bishop. But a prince cannot not fail to mix himself in secular business. I respond: In this passage, secular business is not called political rule, but care of preparing provisions, merchandise and like things. In Greek it is: *tou biou pragmateiais*, which means “in the business of life,” or provisions. It must also be noted that the word “God” is not contained in the Greek or even in all Latin codices, rather the Greek has: *ou deis estirateuomenos empleketai tais tou biou pragmateiais*.

And the sense is: *I have sent you as laborers just as a good soldier of Christ*. Hence, a good soldier is not anxious for the provisions and care of the body, but eats and drinks when he can, and how he can, sleeps on the ground, is clothed more in iron than soft garments, etc. Therefore, the apostle does not forbid political rule, but exceeding care over bodily life; and as Chrysostom rightly warned, these are said by Paul both to a bishop and to other men; for all, both the laity as well as kings, ought to be soldiers of Christ.

Sixthly, they object using the words of Nicholas I in his epistle to the Emperor Michael where he says that before the coming of Christ certain kings were also priests, but Christ the true king and priest separated these: “When in fact he came, he did not take to himself as an emperor any laws beyond the pontificate, nor as pontiff did he usurp the name of emperor, etc.”

I respond: Nicholas refused to deny that some temporal rule can be fitting to the Pope, for he was a political prince of Rome and Ravenna, and his predecessors had long ago received the rule of these cities from their emperors. He only meant to say that it is not fitting that the same man should be the Pontiff of the whole world and at the same time emperor of the whole world, not that it is opposed to the Gospel and in no way could it be done. Since Christ willed to preserve humility, he willed that the Pope should require the defense of the emperor in temporal matters, and at the same time the emperor required the direction of the Pope in spiritual matters. Moreover, what Christ wished is clear from the fact that he left the empire behind to Tiberius, and upon Peter only conferred the pontificate.

End of the Third General Controversy

ON THE PRIMARY DUTY OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF

From a Letter of St. Robert Bellarmine to Pope Clement VIII

Translated from:

EPISTULÆ FAMILIARES ROBERTI BELLARMINI

S.R.E. Cardinalis e Societate Jesu

Pragae, 1753

THE SUPREME PONTIFF bears a threefold person in the Church of God. He is the pastor and ruler of the universal Church; He is bishop of his own city of Rome; he is the temporal prince of the ecclesiastical patrimony. Yet, among all his duties the solicitude for every Church holds the first place. This is the first, the most unique and greatest. It is first because the Apostle Peter was made pastor of the Lord's entire flock long before he was bishop of Antioch or Rome. It is unique because there are many other bishops over very noble cities, and there are many temporal princes, but there is only one Pontiff of the world that is vicar of Christ, and general pastor of the universal Church. Lastly, it is the greatest, because the episcopate of the city of Rome has its own defined limits, and these are narrow enough just like the Church's temporal rule. But the Supreme Pontiff has no limits except those that the world itself has.

Next, the Supreme Pontiff can easily fulfill this duty both ancient and great, singular and both proper to himself and necessary for the Church, if he will put good bishops over every Church, and take care to satisfy his duty that they will be good. Accordingly, good bishops choose good parish priests, good preachers, and good confessors. Therefore, the salvation of souls will be assured so long as he will stand for them.

But if by chance, due to the negligence of bishops or parish priests, some souls should perish, their blood will be required from the hand of the pastors. Moreover, the Supreme Pontiff will liberate his soul, naturally, should he have done what was due to him to make sure these souls would not perish. If, on the contrary, the Supreme Pastor himself would give to particular churches either bishops that were less good, or should he not see to it that they exercise their office; then indeed the blood of these souls will be required at the hand of the supreme Pontiff.

This consideration so vehemently terrifies me that I have compassion for no man more than the Supreme Pontiff, whom most men envy. What St. John Chrysostom writes with a great sense of mind about bishops, specifically that only a few of them would be saved because of the extreme difficulty of giving a good account of the souls committed to their care, certainly applies much more to the occupants of St. Peter's throne. Nor ought we to flatter ourselves with the excuse of a good conscience or right intention on holy works, since the Apostle Paul said: "*Nihil mihi conscius sum, sed non in hoc justificatus sum.*" [843](#) For that reason, supported by apostolic kindness, I lay aside in the bosom of the most pious Father, or rather more at his feet, my scruples, which do not allow me to rest.

Therefore, it seems to me there are six matters which require reformation and cannot be overlooked without great danger. The first is the long vacancy of churches. There is an epistle of St. Leo I to Anastasius, the bishop of Thessalonika, in which the Pope bid that he provide for the churches without delay lest the Lord's flock should suffer from want of pastoral care. There are also extant many things in St. Gregory's epistles, wherein he admonishes those who have the right of election to choose a pastor as soon as possible. And if, by chance, some delay were necessary, the same Pope commended the vacant Church to a neighboring bishop to enjoy the fruits but to manage it in the meantime for the sake of that Church. Therefore, the holiest and most prudent Popes were zealous to immediately provide for vacant churches, lest matters should be effected for souls which, on account of the absence of a pastor, would cause them to perish. For it would be difficult to explain to a few how great a detriment the widowed churches cause; in such the flock falls headlong in suddenness of vices while it lacks a pastor; just as the Lord's vineyard becomes a forest while it lacks a farmer.

The next matter is the promotion of less useful pastors; for they ought to provide for the Church from their personal goods, but not for their person from the goods of the Church. Still, I affirm the best provision is when each can be together, that well deserving persons should be provided to a vacant church. And, so as to pass over other things, the Council of Trent clearly declares that all those who are in any way responsible for the appointment of a bishop would commit mortal sin if they do not choose the men whom they consider most suited for the office and the most likely to be of good service. That is also the common opinion of all Doctors. St. Gregory says it is right order that men be sought for the episcopacy. And St. Bernard says: "One that asks for himself has already been judged. ... round up and compel all those who refuse."

I confess that I have been terrified when I have seen several times persons promoted to cardinalatial sees in consistories although from their advanced age, bad health or lack of episcopal virtues they could hardly be thought fit or of any use so as to have the charge of souls. Nevertheless, custom demands, you may say, that these churches be given to the cardinal priests, in order of seniority, whether they would have the necessary abilities or not. I do not believe custom would ever persuade us to entrust our bodies to aged physicians if through senility or any other cause they were less capable of doing us good. If we take such precautions when our perishable bodily health is at stake, why will we not take them for the sake of immortal souls? I omit the fact that in our time many are ambitious of the episcopal dignity, nay more, they ask and demand it in public, not knowing what they ask for as our Lord says.

Another matter is the absence of bishops from their dioceses. What benefit is it to elect a suitable man if he is never to be at home? The Council of Trent declares that by divine precept bishops must know their flocks, preach the Word of God to them and feed them by the administration of the Sacraments and the example of all good works. bishops are counted among those who are apostolic Nuncios; some of whom have not seen their own churches for many years. Some, since they have left behind the ministry to shepherd the souls entrusted to them, manage secular offices. Many, after they have left behind their sheep, busy themselves in affairs at Rome that can be done suitably by others. I do affirm however, that some bishops are excused from residence through obedience, nor do I deny that the Pope can exempt some bishops from residence for certain reasons and for a certain

period of time. Yet I do not know whether God is pleased when such a number of bishops are absent from their churches for such a long time and with such a detriment to souls—it is clear that they certainly cannot satisfy their office.

Footnotes

[1](#)

Instit., lib. 4, ch. 7, § 23.

[2](#)

Ibid., §24.

[3](#)

Ibid.

[4](#)

Ibid., §25.

[5](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, ch. 4, column 434, and in all subsequent books of the centuries.

[6](#)

Beza, *Commentario 2 Thessalon.*, 2.

[7](#)

Chronicum, tabul. 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14.

[8](#)

2 Thessalonians 2:4.

[9](#)

1 John 2:22.

[10](#)

Matt. 24:5, 24.

[11](#)

De Fide, lib. 4, ch. 28.

[12](#)

Quaestione undecima, ad Algasiam.

[13](#)

Psalm 104 (105):15 We have rendered Christ directly to retain the sense of the original, the term in Greek (Χριστός) means “anointed”, and thus Jesus, the anointed one, the culmination of every precursor of “anointing” in the Old Testament. -Translator’s note.

[14](#)

1 John 2:18.

[15](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, ch. 4, colum. 435.

[16](#)

2 Thessalonians 2:7.

[17](#)

1 John 4:3.

[18](#)

John 5.

[19](#)

Ambrose on 2 Thessal. 2; Jerome, *epist. Ad Algasiam*, quest. 11; Augustine, *Tract. In Joann.*, tract 29; Irenaeus, *Contra haeres.*, lib. 5; Theodoret,

in *Epitome divionorum decretorum*, chapter on Antichrist, and others.

20

Jeremiah 14:14.

21

2 Thessalonians 2: 3, 7-8.

22

Translator's note: To make this clear for those who do not know Greek, the citation is the original for 2 Thessalonians, where a definite article is used for man [*ho anthrōpos*]. In Greek there is a definite article before every noun; normally if it is not included, it means "a" thing instead of "the" thing, except in the case of a predicate nominative, in what is called the attributive position. Therefore, by saying "the man" [*ho anthrōpos*], St. Paul is identifying a specific man, not "a man" in general which he would have done by dropping the article. Lest anyone think this is a weak argument or a semantic point, in the Greek language the poets and dramatists make use of the articles for this very same purpose.

23

Irenaeus, lib. 5; Augustine, *de Civitate Dei*, ch. 23.

24

Translator's note: Antiochus IV (*Epiphanies*, i.e. the Illustrious) was the successor of Alexander the Great's empire in Syria. After losing to the Romans in a war in Egypt he retired to Syria and began the persecution of, the Jews which lead to their uprising recorded in the books of the Maccabees in the Bible.

25

Cyprian, *de exhortations martyrii*, ch. 11; Jerome in Daniel 11 and 12.

26

See Irenaeus, lib. 5 near the end. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesi* 15. Chrysostom, *in 2 Thessal.* 2; Theodoret, *hist.*, ch. 11; Ambrose *in cap. 21 Lucae*; Jerome, *in cap. 7 Danielis et quaest. 11 ad Algasiam*; Augustine, *de civitate Dei*, lib. 21, for many chapters, and *in Psalm 9*; Gregory, *Moral.*, lib. 32, ch. 12; Damascene, lib. 4, ch. 28; and Hippolytus the Martyr, *in oratione de consummatione mundi*.

27

Ad Algasiam, quaest. 11.

28

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 19.

29

Irenaeus, lib. 3, ch. 3.

30

Matthew 17:11-12.

[31](#)

Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylactus and Oecumenius. Additionally, St. Augustine in *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, ch. 19.

[32](#)

Metonym is a linguistic device in classical languages such as Greek and Latin to use a name associated with a certain subject to indicate something in relation to it. Common examples would be “We were busy with Mercury” which would mean we transacted business, because Mercury is the god of commerce, or in the Aeneid book 4 it speaks of the keels of the ships to mean the ships themselves. Thus calling Antichrist Apostasy is to mean there will be a great Apostasy. -Translator’s note.

[33](#)

Ambrose, Sedulius and Primasius.

[34](#)

Lib. 3, epist. 1.

[35](#)

Lib. 4, epistle 6.

[36](#)

Epistola ad Ageruchiam de Monogamia.

[37](#)

Lib. 4, epistle 38.

[38](#)

Homil. 1 in Evangelia.

[39](#)

Diviarum institutionum, lib. 7, ch. 25.

[40](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, ch. 53.

[41](#)

See the Chronicle of Matthew Palmeri, and Platina in *vita Paschalis II*.

[42](#)

Justin, q. 71 *ad Gentes*; Irenaeus *adv. Haer.*, lib. 5;
Lactantius, lib. 7, ch. 14; Hilary on ch. 17 of St.
Matthew; Jerome in Ps. 89 to Cyprian.

[43](#)

Ambrose in *Lucam*, lib. 7, ch. 2.

[44](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 7.

[45](#)

See Augustine, Epistle 80 *ad Hesychium*, in Psalm
89, and *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 18, ch. 53.

[46](#)

2 Thess. 2:4.

[47](#)

Luke 1:33.

[48](#)

Psalm 71 (72):10-11.

[49](#)

Decadis Primae Historiarum, lib. 1, ab Inclinatione
Romani Imperii.

[50](#)

Cent. 6, ch. 1.

[51](#)

De Viduis.

[52](#)

Lib. 2 epist. 8 ad Fuastum de obitu sororis.

[53](#)

Chronicum, tab. 11 & 13. ,

[54](#)

Cent. 8, ch. 10.

[55](#)

Cent. 9, ch. 10.

[56](#)

St. John Damascene, *De Fide*, lib. 4, ch. 28.

[57](#)

Bernard, serm. 6, in Ps. 90.

[58](#)

Matthew 24:14.

[59](#)

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesi* 15; Theodoret in 2 Thessal. 2; Damascene *de fide*, lib. 4, ch. 28; as well as many others.

[60](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 8 & 19.

[61](#)

Origen, *homil. 28 in Matthaeum*.

[62](#)

Ruffinus, *Hist.*, lib.. 10, ch. 9.

[63](#)

Epistle 80.

[64](#)

Cent. 9, ch. 2, col. 15 & 18.; *Cent 10*, ch. 2, column 18 & 19.

[65](#)

Romans 10:15.

[66](#)

Collosians 1: 6.

[67](#)

Epistle 80 to Hesychius.

[68](#)

Psalm. 71 (72):11.

[69](#)

Adv. Haere., lib. 5.

[70](#)

Apocalypse 17: 1-5.

[71](#)

Catechesis 15.

[72](#)

Apologeticus, ch. 32.

[73](#)

Lib. 7, ch. 15.

[74](#)

Quaest. 11 ad Algasiam.

[75](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib.. 20, ch. 19.

[76](#)

Rerum Romanarum, lib. 23.

[77](#)

Chronicum, for the year 810.

[78](#)

Hist., lib. 5, ch. 31.

[79](#)

See Illyricus, *Contra primatum Papae*; *Centur.* 8, ch. 10, col. 751; Chytraeum, *in Apocalyps.*, ch. 13.

[80](#)

De civit. Dei, lib. 20, cap 29.

[81](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 17.

[82](#)

In cap. ult Malachiae.

[83](#)

Tracta. 4 in Ioannem.

[84](#)

In cap. 11 Apocalypsis.

[85](#)

Lib. 4, capite 28.

[86](#)

In oratione de mundi consummatione.

[87](#)

Moralium, lib. 21 36 & lib. 9 cap. 4.

[88](#)

Genes. ad litteram, lib. 9, cap. 6.

[89](#)

In cap. 5 Genes.

[90](#)

Hebrews 11:5.

[91](#)

Lib. 5.

[92](#)

Contra Iudaeos, cap 1 de Henoch.

[93](#)

In Ancorato.

[94](#)

De peccato Originali, cap. 23.

[95](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, ch. 8&9.

[96](#)

From the pagan side, see Cornelius Tacitus on Nero, and from our side Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*.

[97](#)

Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, lib. 8 cap. 6.

[98](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[99](#)

Daniel 7:25 and 12:11-12.

[100](#)

Apocalypse 12:6.

[101](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 15, cap. 14.

[102](#)

In cap. 11 & 13 Apocalypsis.

[103](#)

2 Thess. 2:6.

[104](#)

Sermon 46 in Apocalypsim.

[105](#)

Cent. I, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 438.

[106](#)

Lib. 5, towards the end.

[107](#)

In Danielis, cap. 7.

[108](#)

Catechesis, 25.

[109](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 23.

[110](#)

Apocalypse 12:12.

[111](#)

Apocalypse 20:3.

[112](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20.

[113](#)

Morales lib. 33, cap. 12.

[114](#)

Matthew 24:22.

[115](#)

Translator's note: The Romans had a purifying ceremony every 5 years (*lustrum*) and the word was used as a term for a period of 5 years.

[116](#)

Translator's note: In the Old Testament, a Shemita (*Jubilaeus*) or Jubilee was every 50 years, and here would be used to denote a 50 year period.

[117](#)

Loc. Cit.

[118](#)

Ezechiel 4:5.

[119](#)

Liber *de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, in Ioanne.

[120](#)

Daniel 7:20-22; 23-27.

[121](#)

Apocalypse 20:3-4.

[122](#)

2 Thessalonians 2:8.

[123](#)

Lib. 5.

[124](#)

De Resurrectione.

[125](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[126](#)

Apocalypse 13:16-18.

[127](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4.

[128](#)

Liber 4, cap. 28.

[129](#)

Tabul. 10.

[130](#)

3 Kings (1 Kings) 10:14.

[131](#)

Lib. 5, cap. 30, 3.

[132](#)

Irenaeus, lib. 4, cap. 43.

[133](#)

Serm. 61, *in Apocalypsim*.

[134](#)

Chronicus, tab. 10.

[135](#)

De Resurrectione Carnis.

[136](#)

Lib. 1, epist. 12.

[137](#)

Tractatus in Joannem, 118.

[138](#)

Epistola 162.

[139](#)

De obitu Satyri.

[140](#)

De Persecutione Wandalica, lib. 1.

[141](#)

Lib. 10, epist. 31.

142

De Haeres., cap. 53.

143

De Spiritu Sancto, lib. 3, cap. 12.

144

Apocalypse 13:17. Translator's note: We have revised the Greek text Bellarmine made use of (where three printers errors were found) with the 1904 Nestle-Aland.

145

Epist. 3 *ad Volusianum*.

146

De Civitate Dei, lib. 15, cap. 23.

147

Jerome, *in Daniel.*, cap. 7; Bede, *in Apocal.*, cap. 13; Damascene, lib. 4, cap. 28.

148

Sacrae Historiae, lib. 2.

149

Dialogus de virtutibus, lib. 2.

150

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

151

Lib. 4, cap. 28.

152

Irenaeus lib. 5; Hippolytus *in oratione de mundi consummatione*.; Ambrose, *de Benedictionibus Patriarcharum*, cap. 7; Augustine *in Iosue*, quaest. 22; Prosper of Aquitaine *de promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, pars 4; Theodoret, *in Genesin.*, quest. 109; Gregory *Moralium*, lib. 31, cap. 18; Bede, Rupert, and Anselm, *in Apocal.*, cap. 7.

[153](#)

Jerome, *in Hieremia*.

[154](#)

2 Thessal. 2:10-12.

[155](#)

Quaest. 11, ad Algasiam.

[156](#)

Irenaeus, liber 5; Hippolytus *in oratione de consummatione mundi*; Theodoret *in Epitome divinorum decretorum*, capite de Antichristo; Sulpitius ex B. Martino, *libro 2, Dialogi*; Cyril *Catechesi* 15; Hillary, *in Matthaeum*, can. 25; Ambrose *in Lucam* lib 10, caput 21; Chrysostom, Augustine, and Cyril of Alexandria, in chapter 5 of John; Gregory *Moralium*, lib. 31; cap. 10; Damascene lib. 4, cap. 28.

[157](#)

Found in Sulpitius, *Dialog.*, lib. 2.

[158](#)

Catechesis 15.

[159](#)

Liber II, epist. 3.

[160](#)

Daniel 9:26-27.

[161](#)

Quaest. 11 *ad Algasiam*.

[162](#)

Melancthon, *in apologia confes. Augustanae*, art. 6;
Calvin, *Instit.*, lib. 4, cap. 2 § 12, and cap. 7 § 25;
Illyricus, *Cent.* 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[163](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 1, § 2.

[164](#)

Lib. 4, cap. 2, § 11-12.

[165](#)

Matthew 16:18.

[166](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 15.

[167](#)

Ibid, cap. 17.

[168](#)

Lib. 5.

[169](#)

2 Thessalonians 2:4.

[170](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 19.

[171](#)

Ep. *Ad Riparium*.

[172](#)

Lib. 5.

[173](#)

Catechesi 15.

[174](#)

In cap. 21 Lucae.

[175](#)

lib. 4, cap. 28.

[176](#)

Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, lib. 20, cap. 19; Jerome, Quaest. 11 ad Algasiam.

[177](#)

In Ps. 26.

[178](#)

Lib. *Contra Judaeos; contra Marcionem*, lib. 3.

[179](#)

Loc. Cit.

[180](#)

Praescriptionibus contra haereticos.

[181](#)

1 John 2:22.

[182](#)

John 5:43.

[183](#)

2 Thessalonians 2:4.

[184](#)

Ibid.

[185](#)

Daniel 11:37.

[186](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 7, § 25.

[187](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[188](#)

Daniel 11:38.

[189](#)

De Trinitate, lib. 6.

[190](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 8.

[191](#)

John 5:43.

[192](#)

In Caput 21 Lucae.

[193](#)

In 2 Thess. 2.

[194](#)

Catechesi, 15.

[195](#)

Homil. 40.

[196](#)

Wisdom 15:17.

[197](#)

Loc. Cit.

[198](#)

Catech., 15.

[199](#)

Lib. 1, cap. 20.

[200](#)

Moral., lib. 32, cap. 12.

[201](#)

Catechesis 15.

[202](#)

Apocalypse 13:14-15.

[203](#)

Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Richardus, Rupertus and Anselm interpreting Apocalypse 13.

[204](#)

Lib. XI, epist. 3.

[205](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, co. 436.

[206](#)

Dialog. Lib. 4, cap. 40.

[207](#)

Ibid, lib. 4, cap. 55.

[208](#)

Hist. Eccl., lib. 7, cap. 14.

[209](#)

Theodoret, lib. 8 *ad Graecos*, which is on the martyrs.

[210](#)

Daniel 11:21.

[211](#)

Epistle 162.

[212](#)

De vocatione Gentium, liber 2, cap. 6.

[213](#)

Irenaeus, lib. 5; Lactantius, lib. 7, cap. 16; Theodoret in cap. 7 et 11 Danielis.

[214](#)

Lactantius, lib. 7, cap. 16; Irenaeus, lib. 5.

[215](#)

Catechisis 15.

[216](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[217](#)

Contra Judaeos, lib. 5, cap. 12.

[218](#)

Isaiah 53.

[219](#)

Lib. 7, cap. 24-26.

[220](#)

Hist., lib. 3, last chapter.

[221](#)

Matthew 24:9-14.

[222](#)

Translator's note: This opinion, common in some of the early Fathers, is called Chilism, or Millenarianism, and today, under a different form, the "Rapture." The early Fathers treat it as an opinion, and the later Fathers universally reject it, as do all later theologians. It appears to originate first in the early Father Papias.

[223](#)

Chronologia, tab. 14.

[224](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 18, cap. 45.

[225](#)

See William of Tyre, *de bello sacro*, lib. 6; Paulus Aemilius, *de rebus Francorum*, lib. 4.

[226](#)

De Consideratione, lib. 2.

[227](#)

Vita B. Bernardi, lib. 2, cap. 4.

[228](#)

Centur. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 435.

[229](#)

De fide, lib. 2, cap. ult.

[230](#)

Quaest. Hebraicis in Gen., cap. 10.

[231](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. XX, cap. 11.

[232](#)

Antiquit., lib. 1, cap. 11.

[233](#)

Quaest. Hebraicis in Genes., cap. 10.

[234](#)

Sent., lib. 4, dist. 46, q. 1, artic. 1.

[235](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. 20, cap. 11.

[236](#)

Translator's note: Lacelotto Politi, a Dominican canon lawyer.

[237](#)

Translator's note: This is the Hebrew word as in the Ingolstadt and subsequent editions of the

Controversies, but it is misspelled and we have not been able to discover the Hebrew word that Bellarmine intended.

[238](#)

See the books of Cassian in the *Institutes*, and the *Constitutions of St. Basil*.

[239](#)

Serm. 34.

[240](#)

John 21:17.

[241](#)

Luke 12:42.

[242](#)

Luke 12:45-46.

[243](#)

Sess. 6, ca. 5-8

[244](#)

Isaiah 33:22.

[245](#)

James 4:12.

[246](#)

Proverbs 8:15.

[247](#)

Psalms 2:10.

[248](#)

John 1:33.

[249](#)

St. John Chrysostom, homil. 83 in Matth.

[250](#)

Acts 15:11.

[251](#)

1 Tim. 2:5-6.

[252](#)

Quaest. 149 in *Exodum*.

[253](#)

De Civitate Dei, lib. XXI, cap. 27.

[254](#)

Luke 16:9.

[255](#)

Leo I, *serm. 1 de natali Apostolorum*, Bellarmine's emphasis.

[256](#)

1 Corinth. 9:22.

[257](#)

Jude 1:22-23.

[258](#)

Romans 15:31.

[259](#)

Dist. 40, *si Papa*.

[260](#)

Luther, in a preface to the history that happened in Stasfort, in the year 1536.

[261](#)

Serm. 1 de natali Apostolorum.

[262](#)

Liber *de ingratis*.

[263](#)

Comment. huius loci.

[264](#)

Hist. Eccles., lib. 9, cap. 10.

[265](#)

Catechesi 14.

[266](#)

Vita Constantini, lib. 3 et 4.

[267](#)

In oratione de sancto Martyre Theodoro.

[268](#)

Orat. 1 *in Iulianum*.

[269](#)

Hom. 66 *ad populum Antiochenum*.

[270](#)

De recta fide ad reginas.

[271](#)

Vita Sylvestri.

[272](#)

De officiis, lib. 2, cap. 21.

[273](#)

In comment. cap. 8 *Zachariah*.

[274](#)

In Psalm 113.

[275](#)

Natali tertio Sancti Felicis.

[276](#)

I Timothy 4:1.

[277](#)

Ephesians 4:5.

[278](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4, col. 262.

[279](#)

Romans 10:9.

[280](#)

Hebrews 11:3.

[281](#)

Hist. Ecclesi. lib. 6, cap. 5.

[282](#)

Lib. de cura pro mortuis, cap. 16.

[283](#)

Contra Faustum, lib. 30, cap. 6.

[284](#)

Compendium Theologiae lib. 7, cap. 8

[285](#)

Chapter XIII.

[286](#)

In comment. cap. 11 Danielis.

[287](#)

Coloss. 2:8.

[288](#)

1 John 2:22

[289](#)

2 Thes. 2:3-4.

[290](#)

Coloss. 2:8.

[291](#)

Matt. 24:24.

[292](#)

Coloss. 2:8.

[293](#)

Daniel 11:38.

[294](#)

Apoc. 17:6.

[295](#)

Apocalypse 9:1-11.

[296](#)

Isaiah 14:12.

[297](#)

John 12:31 and 14:30; 2 Cor. 4:4; Ephes. 6:12; Colos. 1:13 and other places.

298

In supputatione temporum.

299

Tab. 10 *Chronol.*

300

63. lib. 7.

301

Translator's note: We must draw the reader's attention to the fact that in Latin, terms like "worship" and "adore" are used in regards to the Blessed Virgin and saints, with the distinction that it is given with *dulia*, a Greek word indicating a lower level of dignity, whereas adoration with *latria* is given to God alone. In English this is generally accomplished with "veneration" and "worship", but we are hesitant to constitute ourselves the correctors of Bellarmine's Latin.

302

Psal. 98 (99):5.

303

Job 5:1.

304

3 Kings (1 Kings) 18:7.

305

4 Kings (2 Kings) 2:15.

306

Isaiah 56:7.

307

Matth. 21:13.

308

Lib. 2 *hist. Eccl.* cap. 33.

309

Romans 4:2.

310

Sess. 6, cap. 8.

311

Ezechiel 18:27.

312

Daniel 4:24.

313

Jonah 3:10.

314

Luke 7:47.

315

In Lucam lib. 10.

316

Lib. 2 *adversus Pelagianos*.

317

Epist. 105.

[318](#)

Epist. 106.

[319](#)

2 Timothy 4:7

[320](#)

Epistle 105.

[321](#)

Luke 7:50.

[322](#)

Psalm 36 (37).

[323](#)

Ezekiel 18:27

[324](#)

Sirach 1:21

[325](#)

Mark 16:16.

[326](#)

John 6:51, 58.

[327](#)

Eccl. 9:1.

[328](#)

Matthew 19:17

[329](#)

Luke 14:26.

[330](#)

Romans 8:16.

[331](#)

in Psalmum 118.

[332](#)

Epist. 23 *ad Bonifacium*.

[333](#)

Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, lib. 1, cap. 13 (27).

[334](#)

Psalm 31 (32):6. Translator's note: Here it must be noted that the Vulgate was revised subsequent to this work to read: "Pro hac orabit ad te omnis sanctus in tempore opportuno." Every one who is holy will pray for this in due season. The original that Bellarmine used is maintained in the translation.

[335](#)

Matth. 6:12.

[336](#)

1 John 5:3.

[337](#)

Matth. 20:8.

[338](#)

De gratia et libero arbitrio, cap. 16 (32).

[339](#)

De Spiritu et litera, ca. 10.

[340](#)

Romans 7:25.

[341](#)

1 Cor. 7:25

[342](#)

De sancta virginitate, cap. 30.

[343](#)

Tract. *in Ioan.* 124, n.5.

[344](#)

de lapsis, serm. 5.

[345](#)

Epist. 6.

[346](#)

Ephes. 2:20.

[347](#)

1 Corinth. 3:11.

[348](#)

Luke 22:24-30, 1 Corinth. 3:4, John 20:21-23 and
Matthew 18:18.

[349](#)

1 Cor. 3.

[350](#)

See Book V.

[351](#)

1 Cor. 7:25.

[352](#)

Proverbs 30:27.

[353](#)

See Cochlaeus in the life and acts of Luther,
MDXXVII.

[354](#)

Translator's note: The Ubiquists (*ubiquisti*) were a branch of Lutherans founded by Brenz that theld the Eucharist, the body of Christ was everywhere because Christ's flesh had been deified. This doctrine persisted until the Thirty Years War.

[355](#)

Assertio art. 25.

[356](#)

Job 41:34.

[357](#)

See Bellarmine, *De Christo*.

[358](#)

Aristophanes, *Birds*.

[359](#)

Isaiah 44; Ephes. 4.

[360](#)

1 Cor. 11:34.

[361](#)

2 Cor. 13:10.

[362](#)

Hebrews 13:17.

[363](#)

1 Tim.. 5:19.

[364](#)

Vita S. Augustini.

[365](#)

Translator's note: The Latin reads "*Papa Ioannes foemina*", but for the sake of ease we have rendered it with the more familiar "Joan" in English. In Latin Ioannes is a 3rd declension proper noun, and will have the same endings for masculine and feminine.

[366](#)

Cap. 23.

[367](#)

Sacrarum Ceremoniarum, lib. 1, sec. 2.

[368](#)

"He raises the poor man out of the dust, the beggar out of the dung pile to sit among the princes and take hold of the throne of glory." 1 Kings (Samuel) 2:8.

[369](#)

Deut. 17:8.

[370](#)

Deut. 17:12.

[371](#)

Epist., 15, n. 2 (ML, XXII, 355).

[372](#)

Epistula 113 *ad Leonem I.*

[373](#)

Epistles, lib. 4, epist 52.

[374](#)

See also Innocent I, *in epistola ad Anastasium Thessalonicensem*; Gelasius I *epistola ad Episcopos Dardaniae*; Nicolas I *epistola ad Michaellem Imperatorem*, Innocent III *epistola ad archatensem Episcopum*, there the chapter is extent “Majores”, and the one on Baptism.

[375](#)

Instit. lib. 4, cap. 7 § 28.

[376](#)

Cap. 9 § 9.

[377](#)

Libris de potestate Ecclesiae.

[378](#)

Lib. 1, cap. 2, *contra haeres.*

[379](#)

Lib. 4 *hier. Eccl.* cap. 8.

[380](#)

St. Thomas Aquinas, 2 *Sentences*, 2 q. 1, art. 10;
Thomas Waldensis, lib. 2, doct. fidei cap. 37 and 48]
Juan Torquemada, lib. 2 *Summae*, cap. 109, et
sequentibus; John Driedo, lib. 4 *de Ecclesiast.*
dogmat. cap. 3, part 3; Cajetan in *de Potestate Papae*
et Concilii, cap. 9; Hosius *contra Brentium*, lib. 2,
which is on legitimate judgments; John of Eck, lib. 1
de primate Petri, cap. 18; John of Louvain, lib. *de*
perpetua cathedrae Petri protectione et firmitate,
cap. 11; Pedro de Soto in his *apologia*, par. 1, cap.
83, 84, and 85; Melchior Cano, *De Locis*, book 6,
cap. 7

[381](#)

Translator's note: We have intentionally used the
early modern English singulars, *thou*, *thee*, *thine* to
maintain the distinctions of Latin and Greek, which
have different forms for the singular and plural 2nd
person pronouns.

[382](#)

De correptione et gratia, cap. 8.

[383](#)

Homil. 83 in Matth.

[384](#)

De vocatione gentium, lib. 1, cap. ult.

[385](#)

In epist. I *ad Episcopos Hispaniae et Galliae*.

[386](#)

Epistle to the Emperor Michael.

[387](#)

Contained in cap. *Maiores, extra, de Baptismo et eius effectu*.

[388](#)

Epist. 190 ad Innocentium.

[389](#)

Book I, Chapter X.

[390](#)

Catena Aurea, Matthew 16:13-19.

[391](#)

Epistola ad Renatum Presbyterum Romanum.

[392](#)

In Psalmo contra partem Donati.

[393](#)

Lib 4, epistol. 32 *ad Mauritium*.

[394](#)

Lib. 7, epist. 37 *ad Eulogium*

[395](#)

Lib 1, cap. 14, 15, 16.

[396](#)

Lib. 2, cap. 13 et 14

[397](#)

Antiquitatum, lib. 3, cap. 12.

[398](#)

De Incarnatione, et gratia Christi ad Fulgentium.

[399](#)

Libro I, epistola 3.

[400](#)

De Ecclesiasticis dogmat. et Scripturis, lib. 4, cap. 3,
par. 3.

[401](#)

Lib. 4, epist. 2.

[402](#)

Lib. 2 *decadis* 1.

[403](#)

Lib. 6.

[404](#)

Epistola 242 *ad populum Romanum*; epistola 243 *ad Conradum imperatorem*.

[405](#)

Serm. 1 *de natali Apostolorum Petri et Pauli*.

[406](#)

John 16:13.

[407](#)

For more on this see Albert Pighius.

[408](#)

Sermon. 2, de consecration Pontificis.

[409](#)

De Baptismo, lib. 1, cap. 18 et alibi

[410](#)

Histor. lib. 7, cap. 4.

[411](#)

De unico Baptismo, cap. 14.

[412](#)

Contra Donatistas, lib. 1, ca. 18.

[413](#)

Dist. 20, can. *de libellis*.

[414](#)

1 Tim. 1:19.

[415](#)

Matthew 26:69-75.

[416](#)

Galatians 2:11-14.

[417](#)

Cent. 2, lib. 2, ch. 10, col. 558, 559, 560. (See: *On the Roman Pontiff*, book 1, ch. 28).

[418](#)

Matth. 23:3.

[419](#)

Cent. 1, lib. 2, ch. 10, colum. 627.

[420](#)

1 Corin. 11: 6-10.

[421](#)

lib. 2, cap 20, col. 628.

[422](#)

lib. 2 hist. ch. 25.

[423](#)

In homily 32 on the *Epistle to the Romans*.

[424](#)

lib. 3, ca. 3.

[425](#)

Cent. 2, cap. 10, col. 212.

[426](#)

Coloss. 2: 16.

[427](#)

Galat. 3: 28.

[428](#)

Rom. 12:4-8; 1 Cor. 12:4-31.

[429](#)

Lib. 5, hist. ch. 28.

[430](#)

Lib. 10, hist. ch. 11.

[431](#)

Epist. 86 to Nicetas of Aquileia.

[432](#)

Cent. 3, ch. 10, col. 277.

[433](#)

Ibid, col. 282.

[434](#)

Cent. 3, ch. 10, col. 277.

[435](#)

lib. 1, epistle 12.

[436](#)

Catechesis 3, mystagogica.

[437](#)

in epistolam Ioannis, tract 6.

[438](#)

Cent. 3, ch. 10, col. 278.

[439](#)

Epist. 122 *ad Victorianum*.

[440](#)

Cent. 3, ch. 6, col. 145 and ch. 7, col. 165.

[441](#)

Lib. 2, epist. 3, *ad Cornelium*.

[442](#)

Centur. 4, ch. 10, colum 1284.

[443](#)

De Ecclesia, lib. 1 cap. 9.

[444](#)

Epist. *ad solitariam vitam agentes*.

[445](#)

Chronicus et Catalogus scriptorium; in Fortunatiano;
In vita Liberii.

[446](#)

Marcellinus, *Historiae suae*, lib. 15; Ruffinus, *Hist.*
lib. 10 cap. 22; Socrates, *Sacrae Historiae*, lib. 2.;
Sozomen, *Hist. Ecclesiastic.*, lib. 2, cap. 29.
Thedoret, Lib. 4 cap 10. Lib. 2, ch. 16 and 17.;
Necephorus, Lib. 9 ch. 35, 36, and 37.

[447](#)

Lib. 4, ca 11.

[448](#)

De Virginibus, lib. 3, in principio.

[449](#)

Haeres. 75.

[450](#)

Adversus Constantium.

[451](#)

Hist., lib. 10, ch. 27.

[452](#)

Hist., lib. 4, ch. 14.

[453](#)

Lib. 9, ch. 37.

[454](#)

Loc. cit.

[455](#)

Sozomen, Lib. 4, ch. 14.; Nicephorus, Lib. 9 ch. 37.

[456](#)

De Ecclesia, lib. 1 ch. 9.

[457](#)

Hist., lib. 10, cap. 22.

[458](#)

Hist., lib. 2, cap. 17.

[459](#)

Hist., lib. 4 ch. 10.

[460](#)

Lib. 4, ch. 80.

[461](#)

in Chronico.

[462](#)

Lib. *Ecclesiast.*, *observationum*, cap. 43.

[463](#)

De vita B. Gregorii, lib. 1, ch. 1.

[464](#)

Chronici Cassiensis, lib. 1, ca. 1.

[465](#)

Here lies the body of St. Felix, Pope and Martyr, who condemned Constantius as a heretic.

[466](#)

Epist. 165.

[467](#)

Lib. 2.

[468](#)

Speculi historialis, lib. 15, ch. 23.

[469](#)

Cent. 4, ch. 10, in *vita Felicis II*.

[470](#)

Translator's note: To be clear, not only historians but even the Church has not followed Bellarmine's judgment on Felix II. On the one hand Bellarmine brings credible arguments; still it muddies the waters even more. Modern historians know that the 2nd formulary of Sirmium, which Liberius signed, was not in itself heretical but could be interpreted as such. But when Bellarmine argues that, essentially, a Pope can be removed from the Pontificate by the Roman Clergy because it appeared that he was heretical, he creates a problem in that by his own admission Liberius was not a heretic. Therefore, how does Liberius cease to be Pope, unless it were by the will of the Church? This too is contrary to what he says in Book II, ch. 30 as well as in this book. Thus we have one possibility: Bellarmine correctly sees in these writings that Felix II was not a heretic, and was received temporarily by the Roman clergy, whether he was intended to be a puppet of the Arians or not, but then defended the faith by an act of God's

providence though he was not a true Pope. Thus, Liberius did not so much become true Pope again (as if he could cease to be Pope while in exile) as resume his control of the Roman Church. This would seem to satisfy the issue, although we would leave it for experts in this area to clarify further.

[471](#)

Institutes, lib. 4, ch. 12 §24.

[472](#)

Epist.2, cap.12.

[473](#)

Cent. 5, cap. 10.

[474](#)

Epistle 22, ch. 1.

[475](#)

See the *Glossa*, 1, quaest. 1, can. Arianos.

[476](#)

Chronicum anni CCCXXXI.

[477](#)

Epist. 79 ad Nicetum.

[478](#)

Cent. 5, ch. 10, in *vita Leonis I.*

[479](#)

Cent. 5, ch. 4, *de coena Domini*; cap. 10 in *vita Gelasii.*

[480](#)

De consecrate., dist. 2, canon.

[481](#)

De Ecclesia lib. 1, cap. 9.

[482](#)

Can. Anastasius, dist. 19.

[483](#)

Cent. 6, cap. 10, in *vita Anastasii*.

[484](#)

Lib. 3, cap. 23.

[485](#)

Lib. 15 and 17.

[486](#)

Canon. *Ita Dominus*, distinction 19.

[487](#)

Bede, Cedrenus, Zonaras and Paul the Deacon.

[488](#)

De gestis Francorum lib.. 2, ch. 32.

[489](#)

Cent. 6, cap. 10, in *vita Vigili*.

[490](#)

Lib. 2, epist. 36 ad Episcopos Hybernicae.

[491](#)

Lib. *de divinis lectionibus*, cap. 1.

[492](#)

Lib. 4, cap. 37.

[493](#)

Lib. 3, epistle 26 to John the bishop of Caralitanum.

[494](#)

In *quaest. De Confirmatione*, last article.

[495](#)

Cent. 7, ca. 10.

[496](#)

Epistle to King Edwin of England, c.f. Bede, lib. 2, *Hist. Anglorum*, cap. 10.

[497](#)

Cent. 7, cap. 10 in *vita ipsius*, and cap. 11, col. 553.

[498](#)

De Locis, lib. 6, last chapter.

[499](#)

De Sex Aetatibus; in *vita Constantini IV Imperatoris*.

[500](#)

Hierarchiae Ecclesiasticae, lib. 4 cap. 8.

[501](#)

Contra Brentium et Joannes a Lovanio, lib. 2; in *de perpetua cathedrae Petri protectione et firmitate*, lib. 2 ch. 11.

[502](#)

Actione 12 et 14.

[503](#)

Epist. 83 *ad Palaestinos*.

[504](#)

Lib. 5, epist. 14 *ad Narsem*.

[505](#)

Dde Ecclesia lib. 2, cap. 93.

[506](#)

Decadis primae, lib. 9.

[507](#)

Translator's note: As with the case of Liberius, it is important to note that Bellarmine is not infallible even though he was a great theologian and historian. While nearly all theologians at his time argued this based on the work of Cardinal Baronius and others, theologians in the later 18th and 19th centuries judged that Bellarmine's second opinion is more probable, namely that Honorius was condemned by way of concession. When the case was reviewed at Vatican I, it was judged that Honorius was condemned for not having done enough to stop heresy. Therefore, while Bellarmine's argument is still possible, since councils can err in points of fact (and we add that he brings many good testimonies that make his case), nevertheless, it has been superseded in the estimation of theologians and Church historians.

[508](#)

Cent. 7, ch. 20.

[509](#)

Epist. Ad Amandum.

[510](#)

Cent. 8, ch. 10, in the life of Gregory III.

[511](#)

Canon: Quod proposuisti, 32, quest. 7.

[512](#)

Septicpate, cap. De Matrimonio.

[513](#)

Tit. De frigidis, cap. ex literis. Translator's note: In the event that the reader is confused, the Church teaches that one must have the capacity to engage in marital relations in order to truly have a Sacramental marriage.

[514](#)

In 20. D. can. E libellis.

[515](#)

In 32 quaest. 7, can. Proposuisti.

[516](#)

As is related de consecr. Dist. 4, can. A quodam Judaeo.

[517](#)

Dist. 4, can. Mulsti; and can. In Synodo.

[518](#)

Canon “in Synodo”, de consec. Dist. 4.

[519](#)

Sententiam lib. 1, de spiritui sancto, cap. 3.

[520](#)

Actor. cap. 10.

[521](#)

4 dist. 3.

[522](#)

Epistle 340.

[523](#)

Cent. 9, ch. 10, in the life of Stephen VI, and *Cent.* 10, ch. 10 in the life of John IX and Sergius III.

[524](#)

Cent. 10, ch. 10.

[525](#)

De Ecclesia, lib. 1, ch. 9.

[526](#)

Cent. 11, ch. 10

[527](#)

De Ecclesia, lib. 1 ch. 9.

[528](#)

Onuphrius, *de Pontificibus*.

[529](#)

Tabul. 13.

[530](#)

Cent. 11, cap. 6, colum 264.

[531](#)

Chronicle for the year 1125.

[532](#)

In *Chronico*.

[533](#)

Metropolis, lib. 5 et *Saxoniae* lib. 5.

[534](#)

Annalium Boiorum, lib. 5.

[535](#)

Instit. Lib. 4, ch. 11, § 13.

[536](#)

De Eucharistia, lib. 3.

[537](#)

De Sacramentis, tomo 2, ch. 43.

[538](#)

Histor., lib. 6, ch. 32.

[539](#)

Ibid, ch. 34.

[540](#)

Ibid, ch. 36.

[541](#)

In Metropoli, lib. 5, c. 20.

[542](#)

Chron., gener. 37.

[543](#)

In Chronico, anni MLXXV

[544](#)

Annalium Boiorum, lib 5, pag. 563.

[545](#)

Epist. 8 ad Gulielmum Abbatem.

[546](#)

Historiae Cassinensis, lib. 3.

[547](#)

Lib.3 Chronici.

[548](#)

Historia Germanica, near the end.

[549](#)

Epist. 8 et initio libri de azyma.

[550](#)

In Apologia pro Gregorio.

[551](#)

De Sacramento Eucharistiae, lib. 1&3.

[552](#)

Annal. Boiorum., lib. 5.

[553](#)

15 quest., 6, canon *Nos Sanctorum*.

[554](#)

Hist., lib. 6.

[555](#)

De bello sacro, capite 13.

[556](#)

Chronicus universalis, parte 17.

[557](#)

Vincentius, *Speculum Historiale*, lib. 25, cap. 44.;
2.2. quaest. 12, art. 2.

[558](#)

Hist. Florentinae, lib. 4, cap. 21.

[559](#)

Decade 2, lib 3.

[560](#)

Tomo 2, cap. 43.

[561](#)

Secunda Parte Summae Historialis, tit. 16, cap. 1 §
21

[562](#)

Metropolis, lib. 5

[563](#)

Enneade 9, lib. 3

[564](#)

Anthropologiae lib. 22; *res gestas Gregorii*.

[565](#)

De Haeresibus, lib 1 cap. 4

[566](#)

Cap. Quanto.

[567](#)

Sess. 24, can 5.

[568](#)

Translator's note: *Extravagantes* refer to papal decrees not contained in certain canonical collections which were obligatory for the Church, but not in the corpus of medieval canon law. There were several by this title.

[569](#)

Summae, lib. 2, cap. 112.

[570](#)

Acts 4:32-36.

[571](#)

Opus 93, dierum.

[572](#)

Quaestio de Confirmatione.

[573](#)

Prefatione ad li. 5 Irenaei.

[574](#)

Institut. Lib 4 cap. 7, §28.

[575](#)

Contra Haeres., liber 3 in verbo Beatitudo.

[576](#)

Histor. lib. 11 Capite 19.

[577](#)

Lib. 11, ch. 19.

[578](#)

Trithemius, *de viris illustribus*.

[579](#)

Institut. lib 3, cap. 20.

[580](#)

Ibid, §24.

[581](#)

Histoiria, lib. 10, cap. ult.

[582](#)

cf. John Villanus, lib. 11 cap. 19, wherein the calumnies of Erasmus may also be detected.

[583](#)

Sess. 37.

[584](#)

Sess. 34.

[585](#)

Geographiae, lib. 7.

[586](#)

Libro arbitrio, lib. 1, cap. 5.

[587](#)

Aristotle *Ethici*, lib. 8, cap. 10.

[588](#)

Until the imposition of the 1983 Code of Canon Law, Catholics in normal conditions had to fast (only one

full meal) every day of Lent. –Translator’s note.

[589](#)

Ad Ephesios, in cap. 6.

[590](#)

In Psal. 124, serm. 6 *de verbis Domini*.

[591](#)

De praecepto, et dispensatione.

[592](#)

Matthew 5:40.

[593](#)

1 Peter 2:18.

[594](#)

4 part tit. 11, cap. 7, §2 *Summae Theologicae*.

[595](#)

Liber V, *hierarchia Ecclesiastica*.

[596](#)

38 damnato sessione 8 Concilii Constantiensis.

[597](#)

Lib. I sui Anti-Lutheri.

[598](#)

Assertionis Lutherani Confutatio, in assertione
articuli 27.

[599](#)

Translator’s note: Cochlaeus’ works have rarely
made it to English translation, but his life of Luther

was translated along with Melanchthon's encomium in the following work: *Luther's Lives: Two Contemporary Accounts of Martin Luther*, Manchester University Press.

600

Art. 28.

601

Instit., cap. 10, 11, et 12.

602

Lib. 4, epist. 9

603

Constitutiones monastici, cap. 23

604

Acts 15:28-29.

605

Acts 15:41.

606

Acts 16:4.

607

Homil. 33 in Acta.

608

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 10, §21 and 22.

609

1 Corinth. 8:7, 9-10.

610

1 Corinth. 10:28-29.

[611](#)

Apologeticus, cap. 9.

[612](#)

Lib. 8 *contra Celsum*

[613](#)

Historiae, lib. 5, cap. 1.

[614](#)

Epistol. 154 *ad Publicolam*.

[615](#)

Epist. 70 *ad Nicetam*, cap. 5.

[616](#)

I Corinthians 8:23.

[617](#)

“For if we must obey princes not only from fear of punishment but for conscience’s sake, it seems to follow that the laws of princes have dominion over the conscience. If this is true, the same thing must be affirmed of ecclesiastical laws. I answer, that the first thing to be done here is to distinguish between the genus and the species. For though individual laws do not reach the conscience, yet we are bound by the general command of God, which enjoins us to submit to magistrates. And this is the point on which Paul’s discussion turns—viz. that magistrates are to be

honored, because they are ordained of God.” *Instit.*, lib. 4, cap. 10, §5.

[618](#)

Epist. 54 *ad Macedonium*.

[619](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 10 §5.

[620](#)

Lib. 3, cap. 1, *contra epist. Parmeniani*.

[621](#)

De consens. Evangel., lib. 2, cap. 30

[622](#)

In comment. cap. 5 *primae ad Corinth.*

[623](#)

Can. 69.

[624](#)

Lib. 4, epist. 9, cf. St. Basil, *in constitutionibus*, cap. 22.

[625](#)

Constitutionibus, cap. 22.

[626](#)

Volume 1, book 2, ch. 29.

[627](#)

Orat. 2 de ieiunio.

[628](#)

Homil. 6 to the people of Antioch

629

Serm. 25.

630

Serm. 62 de tempore.

631

Serm. 3, de ieiunio decimi mensis.

632

Haeresi 75; haeres. 63.

633

John 12:26.

634

Bellarmino gives the citation for this as: *Epist. 118, cap. 6*, but subsequent to his time this has been revised in the collection of Augustine's works and is found in Migne's edition of Augustine's works under *Epistle 54*, no. 8. –Translator's note.

635

Ethic. lib. 10, ca. 9.

636

“Sin is lawlessness.” I John 3:4. Translator's note: Bellarmine here quotes the Septuagint; the Vulgate has “All sin is iniquity.”

637

Deuteronomy 4:2.

638

Esther 9:20-21, 27.

[639](#)

Judith 16:31.

[640](#)

1 Maccabees 4:59.

[641](#)

1 Kings (1 Samuel) 30:25.

[642](#)

In cap. 1 ad Gal. lect. 2 et 3.

[643](#)

James 4:12.

[644](#)

Lib. 1 epist. 3.

[645](#)

Isaiah 29:13-14.

[646](#)

Lib. 4 cap. 25 and 26.

[647](#)

Lib 2, cap. 12.

[648](#)

Galatians 5:1.

[649](#)

Romans 6: 18.

[650](#)

2 Cor. 3:17.

651

Gal. 3:13.

652

De continentia, cap. 3.

653

Acts 15:10.

654

Gal. 5:1.

655

1 Peter 2:13, 16.

656

2 Peter 2:19.

657

Gal. 5:13.

658

Acts 15:10.

659

Translator's note: The reader should keep in mind that before the Pio-Benedictine reform of 1917, canon law was a difficult discipline, having multiple volumes and requiring a wide knowledge of what laws had been superseded and what laws were still in force, and these occupied many volumes and commentaries.

660

Ep. 119, ch. 19.

[661](#)

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 10 §13.

[662](#)

Hebrews 7:12.

[663](#)

4 Kings (2 Kings) 16:10.

[664](#)

3 Kings (1 Kings) 8:64.

[665](#)

4 Kings (2 Kings) 17:25, 29, 33.

[666](#)

1 Cor. 7:23.

[667](#)

Ephesians 6:5.

[668](#)

1 Cor. 7:21.

[669](#)

Ephesians 6:5-6.

[670](#)

Instit. lib. 4, cap. 10, §5.

[671](#)

cf. Wisdom 6:1-9, Romans 13:1-7, 1 Corinth. 4:1-2.

[672](#)

Romans 13:1.

[673](#)

Lib. 2 capit. 45.

[674](#)

Tract. 12 *in Matthaeum*.

[675](#)

Moral. lib. 20, cap. 6.

[676](#)

Lib. 2 *de sacerdotio*, no. 3.

[677](#)

Contra Faustum, lib. 22, cap. 27.

[678](#)

Libro de paradise, cap. 8.

[679](#)

De Consideratione, lib. 1.

[680](#)

See on this power in Juan de Torquemada lib. 1, cap. 93.

[681](#)

In a book which he calls *Defensores*, part 2, cap. 62.

[682](#)

Lib. 1, *summae*, cap. 96.

[683](#)

Ephes. 4.

[684](#)

In relect. 2 *de potestate Ecclesiae*.

[685](#)

Lib. 2, cap. 24 *de justa haereticorum punitione*.

[686](#)

Lib. 2, cap. 54 *summae de Ecclesia*.

[687](#)

Lib. 10 *de Conciliis*, arctic.7.

[688](#)

Tractatus de auctoritate Papae et Concilii, cap. 3.

[689](#)

4 dist. 20, quaest. 1, arctic. 2.

[690](#)

De potestate Papae.

[691](#)

In canonem Missae, lect. 3.

[692](#)

1 Cor. 5:1-5; 9-12.

[693](#)

1 Corinthians 6:1-7, 7:1-40, 11:1-34, 14:1-40 and other places.

[694](#)

See St. Thomas in chapter 12 of First Corinthians.

[695](#)

Q. 18 in librum Numeri.

[696](#)

In epist. 131 ad Mediolanenses.

[697](#)

Serm. 3 *de assumptione sua ad Pontificatum*.

[698](#)

In Psal. 144.

[699](#)

Florence, *instruct. Armenorum*; Trent, Sess. 23, cap. 4.

[700](#)

Epist. 2.

[701](#)

In cap. 20 Luc.

[702](#)

Haeresi 20, which is of the Herodians.

[703](#)

Acts 20:28.

[704](#)

Lib. 3 epistola 9, ad Rogantium.

[705](#)

Liber 3 de consideration.

[706](#)

Romans 13:1.

[707](#)

Summa de potestate Ecclesiae, quaest. 1, art. 1.

[708](#)

Lib. 1 *de planctu Ecclesiae*, capite 13.

709

In cap. *Quod super his*, on vows and the fulfillment of vows.

710

In cap. *Novit*, de iudiciis.

711

In *Summa de Peccatis*, verbo Papa, §2.

712

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 11, § 8-14.

713

In cap. 13 ad Rom.

714

Cent. 1, libro 2, cap. 4, colum. 435.

715

Centur. 8-11, cap. 10.

716

Quodlibet 6, quaest. 23.

717

De libertate Christiana, lib. 2, cap. 2.

718

Summae, lib. 2, cap. 113 et sequentibus

719

Hierarchia Ecclesiastica, lib. 5.

720

Lib. 2 *Doctr. Fid.* arctic. 3 cap. 76-78.

[721](#)

In libro *Potestate Ecclesiastica*.

[722](#)

Apologia, caput 13 ad 6.

[723](#)

Quaest. *de potestate Ecclesiae*.

[724](#)

In 4, dist. 25, quaest. 2, art. 1.

[725](#)

Lib. 2, cap. 4, *Visibilis Monarchiae*.

[726](#)

S.T., II IIae, quaest. 40, art. 2.

[727](#)

John 21.

[728](#)

1 Corinth. 5:12.

[729](#)

Daniel 2:37.

[730](#)

Matth. 22:21.

[731](#)

Translator's note: This is the *Treaty of Tordisillas*.

Many popular historians today falsely hold that this treaty divided the whole world between the Spanish and Portugese, but this is to take what Spanish jurists

argued as a fact when, in reality, no such right was ever granted by the Pope, as Bellarmine shows here.

[732](#)

Translator's note: This hymn is used for Vespers on the feast of the Epiphany.

[733](#)

In oratione de tradendis basilicis.

[734](#)

Epist. 38 ad Martianum.

[735](#)

Epist. 43

[736](#)

Found in the decretals, d. 96, can. *Duo sunt*

[737](#)

Lib. 2, epist. 61 ad Mauritium.

[738](#)

Epist. ad Michaellem.

[739](#)

Cap. *Si duobus*, §. *denique*, extra de appellationibus.

[740](#)

Ibid, cap. *Caussam*, 2. extra, *qui filii sint legitimi*.

[741](#)

Per venerabilem, extra *qui filii sint legitimi*.

[742](#)

Ibid.

[743](#)

Walld. lib. 2, doctr. fidei, art. 3, cap. 76.

[744](#)

Matthew 1:16.

[745](#)

Jeremiah 20:24.

[746](#)

Lib. 3 in Luc. cap. 1.

[747](#)

de Civitate Dei, lib. 17, cap. 7.

[748](#)

John 12:31.

[749](#)

Colos. 2:15.

[750](#)

2 Paralip. (Chronicles) 26:17-20.

[751](#)

Matthew 11:8.

[752](#)

Matt. 28:18.

[753](#)

Distinc. 22, can. *Omnes*.

[754](#)

Luke 22:38.

[755](#)

De consideration, lib. 4.

[756](#)

In extravaganti, Unam Sanctam, de maiori et obedientia

[757](#)

Novit, de iudiciis.

[758](#)

Cap. Licet, de foro competenti.

[759](#)

Clement. pastoralis, de sententia et re iudicata.

[760](#)

Ad cap. Possessor, de regula Juris in Sexto.

[761](#)

De consideration, lib. 1

[762](#)

cap. Per venerabilem, on those who would be legitimate sons.

[763](#)

I Ethic. lib. 1, cap. 1.

[764](#)

Romans 12:4-8; 1 Cor. 12:4-31.

[765](#)

de Consideratione, lib. 4.

[766](#)

loc. cit.

[767](#)

Instit. lib. 4, cap. 11 §10.

[768](#)

Deut. 17:15.

[769](#)

II Ilae, quaest. 10, article 10.

[770](#)

1 Cor. 6:4-5.

[771](#)

Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 10:2.

[772](#)

3 (1) Kings 12:26-33.

[773](#)

1 Cor. 7:12-26; Innocent III, cap. *Gaudeamus*.

[774](#)

Luke 14:26.

[775](#)

John 21:17.

[776](#)

Matthew 7:15.

[777](#)

Epist. 50 *ad Bonifacium*; epist. 75 *ad Leonem Augustum*,; Gregory lib. 2 epist. 61 *ad Mauritium*.

[778](#)

See more in Nicholas Sanders, *de visibili Monarchia*, lib. 2, cap. 4. There you will discover many of those things we said above.

[779](#)

Leviticus 13:45.

[780](#)

In questionibus Evangel., lib. 2, quaest. 40.

[781](#)

1 Cor. 10:6, 11.

[782](#)

4 Kings (2 Kings) 11:9.

[783](#)

2 Paral. (Chron.) 24:14-15.

[784](#)

Theodoret, *hist.* lib. 5, cap. 17.

[785](#)

Cent. 8 cap. 10 *in vita Gregorii II*

[786](#)

In Vita Leonis Isauri.

[787](#)

Lib. 6, cap. 5 de gestis longobardorum.

[788](#)

Cent. 8, cap. 10.

[789](#)

In Chronicles.

790

Book 2, ch. 17.

791

Cap. *Venerabilem, extra de electione and Clementina unica de jurejurando*.

792

Centur. 8 cap. 10, colum. 751.

793

Tabula 10 *suae Chronologiae*.

794

Lib. 5 *Hierarch. Ecclesiasticae*, cap. 14.

795

Translator's note: Here, Bellarmine refers to the attempt to get the archbishop of Cologne to convert to Lutheranism so as to have enough electors to elect a Lutheran prince over the Empire. The archbishop was given to hunting and the trappings of aristocracy, but was not a theologian, and went in that direction until the maneuvering of Charles V destroyed the Smalkaldic league and made that impossible. A detailed account from primary sources can be found in *St. Peter Canisius*, by Broderick, S.J., in chapter 3.

796

Lib. 2.

797

Lib. , cap. 31; see also Blondus lib. 5, decadis 2, and Platina *in vita Alexander III*.

[798](#)

Dist. 93.

[799](#)

In vita Irenae.

[800](#)

Lib. 23 *Rerum Romanarum*.

[801](#)

In Chronico anni DCCC.

[802](#)

In Metropoli, lib. 1, cap. 14

[803](#)

Lib. 5, cap. 31

[804](#)

Cap. *Venerabilem, de electione*.

[805](#)

Blondus, decade 2, lib. 3; Nauclerus, *generat*. 34;
Platina *in vita Gregorii V*.

[806](#)

Cent. 10, cap. 10, col. 546

[807](#)

Lib. *de comitiis imperialibus*.

[808](#)

In that chapter *Venerabilem*.

809

Lib. 1 art. 41, de planctu Ecclesiae.

810

Cent. 11, cap. 10, in *vita Gregorii VII*.

811

Book 4, ch. 12.

812

Decade 2, lib. 6.

813

Cap. *ad Apostolicae de sentential et re iudicata*, in *sexto*.

814

That is found in the chapter *Grandi*, on the supplying for the negligence of Prelates, in the sixth.

815

Libro *Hierarch. Ecclesiasti*. 5, cap. 14 et 15.

816

De utroque gladio, tomo 2, theoremate 7.

817

Summae, lib. 2, cap. ult. et penultimo.

818

Lib. 5, cap. 15.

819

Translator's note: The temporal sovereignty refers to the Papal States, which the Pope ruled since ancient

times, and that he continued to hold through Bellarmine's time even until 1870. While in modern times this discussion might be said to be redundant, still there are important principles which Bellarmine discusses here.

820

Instit., lib. 4, cap. 11, §8 and 11.

821

Hebrew Questions, on Genesis 49, *Ruben primogenitus meus*..

822

2 Chronicles, 26:18.

823

Philo, *de vita Moysis*, lib. 3.

824

Q. 68 in Exod.

825

Q. 23 in Levit.

826

Antiquit. lib. 12, et sequentibus.

827

Chronicus anni DCC. XXVIII.

828

Book. 4, ch. 13.

829

Ibid.

[830](#)

Dist. 63.

[831](#)

Chronici Cassiensi, lib. 1, cap. 9

[832](#)

loc. cit., lib. 3, cap. 48.

[833](#)

Matth. 22:21.

[834](#)

Instit., lib. 4, c. 11, §8.

[835](#)

Q. 23 in Levit.

[836](#)

Ibid, §9.

[837](#)

Luke 12:14.

[838](#)

Exodus 18:27.

[839](#)

Lib. 1 *de Consideratione*.

[840](#)

Ibid § 11; Lib. 2 *de consid.*

[841](#)

Ibid, §14.

842

Lib. 4, epist. 44.

843

“For I am not conscious to myself of anything. Yet I am not justified in this; rather the one that judges me is the Lord.” 1 Corinthians 4:4.